

The
Church of England Pulpit,



AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

283.05
CHUO
v. 28



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

THE
Church of England Pulpit.

AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.



JULY TO DECEMBER, 1889.

VOL. XXVIII.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160 FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXVIII.

SERMONS ON :—

PAGE

Walking by Faith—By Rev. W. Done Bushell, M.A. ...	1
Less than All—Nothing—By Rev. Augustus Jessop, D.D. ...	3
The Lord's Prayer—By Late Rev. J. C. Napleton, B.A. ...	13
The Law of Liberty—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. ...	18
Peter and Cornelius—By Archbishop of Canterbury ...	25
The Late Canon Cook—By Rev. Henry Wace, D.D. ...	28
The Mystery of the Trinity—By Ven. Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D. ...	37
The Queen of Sheba and the Shah—By Rev. Harry Jones, M.A. ...	40
The Christian's Obedience to Civil Government—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. ...	43
Life and Character—The "Going Forth" of Man—By Rev. H. S. Swithinbank, M.A. ...	49
True Christian Zeal—By Rev. John Spence, B.D. ...	51
The Gradual Revelation of the Lord—By Very Rev. Randall T. Davidson, D.D. ...	61
The Songs of the Christian Pilgrim—By Rev. Benjamin Maturin, M.A. ...	64
Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. I.—Perilous Times—By Rev. E. A. Cooke ...	66
The Gospel of the Blessed God—By the Bishop of Exeter ...	73
The Improvement of Sunday-school Teaching—By Rev. Thos. Jordan, M.A. ...	76
Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. II.—Redeeming the Time—By Rev. E. A. Cooke ...	78
Peace and Prosperity Conditional on Obedience—By Rev. C. P. Roberts, M.A. ...	85
The Two Services—By Rev. Henry Thompson ...	87
Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. III.—Separation from the World—By Rev. E. A. Cooke ...	88
Christian Evidence Work—By Rev. Alex. J. Harrison, B.D. ...	97
Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. IV.—Earnestness in Service—By Rev. E. A. Cooke ...	102
The Ruling of the Spirit—By Rev. Charles E. Tisdall, D.D. ...	109
Christian Sympathy the Need of our Times—By Rev. Joseph Maskell ...	111
Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. V.—The Prayerful Spirit—By Rev. E. A. Cooke ...	114
The Acceptable Offering—By the Bishop of Cork ...	121
The End of all Ritual—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. ...	123
Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. VI.—Fidelity in Peril—By Rev. E. A. Cooke ...	125
Elijah—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A. ...	133
How to Devote the Heart to God—By Rev. Walter B. Money, M.A. ...	136

SERMONS ON :—

PAGE

The Testimony of the Resurrection—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett, M.A. ...	145
The Danger of being "In Touch with the Laity"—By Rev. George Webster, D.D. ...	148
The Church Pastoral Aid Society—By Rev. J. George Gibson ...	157
The Advantages to the Laity of being in Touch with the Clergy—By Rev. George Webster, D.D. ...	160
Cardiff Church Congress : The Inaugural Address—By the Bishop of Llandaff ...	169
The Conversion of St. Paul—By Rev. J. A. Carr, LL.D. ...	173
Work for the King—By the Bishop of Ossory ...	181
Christian Gratitude—By Rev. J. P. Sandlands, M.A. ...	183
Justification—By Rev. J. J. Sherrard, B.D. ...	185
Jehu and Elijah.—False and True Zeal—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A. ...	193
The Holy Angels—By Rev. W. Done Bushell, M.A. ...	196
How to Obtain Peace—By Rev. R. R. Kane, LL.D. ...	198
The Magnificat—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	205
The Prophecy of Mary—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	217
A Pastor's Farewell—By Rev. C. A. Molony, M.A. ...	222
Three Dangers in Church Congresses—By the Bishop of Derry ...	229
Harvest Festival—By Rev. J. Maskell ...	233
God's Power—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	241
Personal Influence—By Rev. Thomas Field, M.A. ...	246
The Kingdom of Christ—By the Bishop of Edinburgh ...	253
The Soul and its Value—By Rev. Philip Dwyer, M.A. ...	256
Self-Sacrifice—By the Bishop of London ...	265
Racing and Wrestling : Images of the Christian Life—By Rev. C. B. Brigstocke, M.A. ...	268
The Glory of God in Sickness—By Rev. J. A. Carr, LL.D. ...	271
Charity Sermon—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. ...	277
The Gospel to the Poor : a Sermon for the Rich—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. ...	280
Christian Conduct—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. ...	282
Truth in the Old Testament—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ...	289
Christianity the Antidote to Slavery—By Rev. A. Plummer, D.D. ...	294
Absolution—By the Bishop of Derry ...	301
Inspiration of the Bible—By Rev. W. Done Bushell, M.A. ...	302
The Joy of Harvest—By Rev. J. W. Kaye, M.A. ...	305

SERMONS BY :—

Archbishop of Canterbury—Peter and Cornelius ...	25
Bishop of Exeter—The Gospel of the Blessed God ...	73

SERMONS BY :—

PAGE

Bishop of London—Self-Sacrifice	265
Bishop of Llandaff—Cardiff Church Congress : The Inaugural Address	169
Bishop of Cork—The Acceptable Offering	121
Bishop of Derry—Three Dangers in Church Congresses	229
Bishop of Derry—Absolution... ..	301
Bishop of Edinburgh—The Kingdom of Christ	253
Bishop of Ossory—Work for the King	181
Davidson, Very Rev. Randall T., D.D.—The Gradual Revelation of our Lord	61
Bassett, Rev. Prebendary, M.A.—The Testimony of the Resurrection	145
Bladon, Rev. George, B.A.—The End of all Ritual	123
Brigstocke, Rev. C. B., M.A.—Racing and Wrestling : Images of the Christian Life	268
Bushell, Rev. W. Done, M.A.—Walking by Faith	1
Bushell, Rev. W. Done, M.A.—The Holy Angels	196
Bushell, Rev. W. Done, M.A.—Inspiration of the Bible	302
Carr, Rev. J. A., LL.D.—The Conversion of St. Paul	173
Carr, Rev. J. A., LL.D.—The Glory of God in Sickness	271
Cooke, Rev. E. A.—Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. I.—Perilous Times	66
Cooke, Rev. E. A.—Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. II.—Redeeming the Time	78
Cooke, Rev. E. A.—Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. III.—Separation from the World	88
Cooke, Rev. E. A.—Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. IV.—Earnestness in Service	102
Cooke, Rev. E. A.—Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. V.—The Prayerful Spirit	114
Cooke, Rev. E. A.—Christian Duties in Perilous Times. No. VI.—Fidelity in Peril	125
Dwyer, Rev. Philip, M.A.—The Soul and its Value	256
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon F. W., D.D.—The Mystery of the Trinity	37
Field, Rev. Thomas, M.A.—Personal Influence	246
Gibson, Rev. J. George—The Church Pastoral Aid Society	157
Harrison, Rev. Alex. J., B.D.—Christian Evidence Work	97
Jessop, Rev. Augustus, D.D.—Less than All—Nothing	3
Jones, Rev. Harry, M.A.—The Queen of Sheba and the Shah	40
Jordan, Rev. Thos., M.A.—The Improvement of Sunday-school Teaching... ..	76
Kane, Rev. R. R., LL.D.—How to Obtain Peace... ..	198
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—The Law of Liberty	18
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—The Christian's Obedience to Civil Government	43
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—Christian Conduct	282
Kaye, Rev. J. W., M.A.—The Joy of Harvest	305
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—The Gospel to the Poor : a Sermon for the Rich	280
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Magnificat	205
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Prophecy of Mary	217
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—God's Power... ..	241
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—Truth in the Old Testament	289
Maskell, Rev. Joseph—Christian Sympathy the Need of our Times	111
Maskell, Rev. J.—Harvest Festival	233
Maturin, Rev. Benjamin, M.A.—The Songs of the Christian Pilgrim	64
Molony, Rev. C. A., M.A.—A Pastor's Farewell	222
Money, Rev. Walter B., M.A.—How to Devote the Heart to God... ..	136
Napleton, Late Rev. J. C., B.A.—The Lord's Prayer	13
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—Charity Sermon	277

SERMONS BY :—

PAGE

Plummer, Rev. A., D.D.—Christianity the Antidote to Slavery	294
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon, M.A.—Elijah	133
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon, M.A.—Jehu and Elijah. — False and True Zeal	193
Roberts, Rev. C. P., M.A.—Peace and Prosperity Conditional on Obedience	85
Sandlands, Rev. J. P., M.A.—Christian Gratitude	183
Sherrard, Rev. J. J., B.D.—Justification	185
Spence, Rev. John, B.D.—True Christian Zeal	51
Swithbank, Rev. H. S., M.A.—Life and Character.—The "Going Forth" of Man	49
Tisdall, Rev. Charles E., D.D.—The Ruling of the Spirit	109
Thompson, Rev. Henry—The Two Services	87
Wace, Rev. Henry, D.D.—The late Canon Cook... ..	28
Webster, Rev. George, D.D.—The Danger of being "In Touch with the Laity"	148
Webster, Rev. George, D.D.—The Advantages to the Laity of being in Touch with the Clergy	160

LEADING ARTICLES :—

The Fixed Clergy	5
Nimes and the Peace Movement	6
Clerical Holidays	20
Churchmen	30
Follow my Leader	45
Bellicose "Boys' Brigades"	46
Comprehension has its Limits	54, 91, 104
The New Admiralty Panic	55
Bride and Bridegroom	69
The Cardiff Church Congress... ..	70
Wanted—A Gospel for the Century	80
Cantankerous Churchmen	117
Going Ahead too Fast... ..	128
Fishing in Troubled Waters	139
Overcrowded Cemeteries	151
Pirate Missions... ..	163
Monastic Orders	175
The Church Congress on Home Reunion	187
The Ministry of Women	201
Labour and Exercise	211, 225
Free Education... ..	234
Un denominationalism	249, 261
Our English Cathedrals	273
Jewish Converts in Trouble	284
Insanitary Houses in London	297
Cleanliness—I	307

PAPERS :—

Moses and other Ancient Lawgivers — By Rev. Henry G. Carroll, M.A.	7
Burial Reform—By Rev. F. Lawrence	21
The Future of English Theology	31
Robert Elsmere—By Rev. W. S. Green, M.A.	92
Three Texts Commonly Misapprehended	94
Savonarola—His Life and Times—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D.	140, 163
The Reunion of Christendom... ..	152
On the Moral Aspects of a Labour Strike	176
The Bishop of Peterborough on Socialism, Gambling, and Betting	212

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"The Ministry of the Christian Church"—By Charles Gore, M.A.	10
"The Expositor"	22, 70, 129, 179, 226, 285
"The Treasury"	22
"A Charge by James Moorhouse, D.D., Bishop of Manchester"	55
"Thomas Becket, Martyr Patriot"—By Thomas Anchor Thompson, M.A.	70
"The Times of the Kings of Judah and Israel"—By Professor Rawlinson	117
"The Confessional in the Christian Church"—By Rev. Marshall C. Vincent	129

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

PAGE

"The Rigorist Doctrine of Fasting Communion Unreasonable; Unsupported by Holy Scripture; Unhistorical and Untheological. A Remonstrance"—By an English Priest ...	155
"The Credentials of the Gospel. A Statement of the Reason of the Christian Hope"—By Rev. Agar Joseph Beet... ..	213
"The Sermon Bible." Vol. IV. Isaiah to Malachi ...	235
"Imago Christi: The Example of Jesus Christ"—By Rev. James Stalker, M.A.	235
"Christian Union"—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A.	261
"Catechetical Instruction, &c."—By Rev. William Sherrard	262
"Synoptical Lectures on the Books of the Holy Scripture"—By Donald Fraser, D.D.	298
"Labour and Life of the People"—By Charles Booth	308
"The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity"—By George T. Purvis, D.D. "Justin Martyr's Apology." " <i>The Expositor</i> ." November, 1887. "The Didache and Justin Martyr"	309

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Bishop Ken.—The <i>Te Deum</i>	11
Clandestine Marriages	11
The Fatherhood of God 22, 33, 56, 71, 81, 95, 105, 118, 129, 156, 166, 191, 202, 214, 226, 236, 262, 286, 299,	311
Extension of Incarnation ... 23, 59, 95, 118,	129
The Sign of Jonah the Prophet	34
The Resurrection	34
The Ministry of the Christian Church	34
The Church Catechism	35, 107
Church Government	47, 95
The Irish Church Prayer Book	47, 83, 95
Review of God's Ministry	47
A Personal Explanation	58, 190
<i>Odium Theologicum</i>	59
The Irish Expurgation of the Athanasian Creed	72
The Ornament Rubric.—Mr. Tomlinson.—Dean Perowne	84
Comprehension... ..	118
The New Education Scheme... ..	130, 142
Churchmen in Council... ..	130, 190, 202
The Forgiveness of Sins	142, 249
The Church of Ireland	165
Divine Influences Transforming Human Character	167, 179, 191
Fidelity in Peril	168
Defence of the Communicated Article of August 31	179
The Reunion of Christendom... ..	180, 189
Christian Gratitude	202, 215, 227, 236
Home Reunion... ..	202
Mr. Sherrard's Sermon on Justification	203
Their Deeds do Follow Them	215
God's Power to Forgive Sins	237
Gambling	238
<i>Adversaria</i>	238
Party Explanations of the Catechism	250
Short Sermons	250
St. John vi.	274, 310
The Principles of Action	275

CORRESPONDENCE :—

PAGE

Misconceptions	285
The Review of Canon Rawstorne's Paper	300
How Paddy Got Rid of the Ornaments Rubric	311

POETRY :—

Forgiveness (Joseph John Murphy)	35
The Wayside Flowers (John W. Kaye)	48
St. Paul in Arabia (Joseph John Murphy)	131
Mountain Summits (Joseph John Murphy)	312

MISCELLANEOUS :—

Prayer for the Bishop of Truro	5
Salvation only as a Gift	21
Retreats for Members of Oxford University... ..	24
Cardiff Church Congress	24
The Principal of Brasenose and the Heads of Oxford	45
Reception of a Romanist into the English Church	54
Oxford Diocesan Conference	59
Mansfield College, Oxford	59
Rev. J. S. Flynn, Chaplain to Seamen's Mission	107
Rev. Christopher Bowen	108
Diocesan Council for Welfare of Young Men	108
The Dean of St. Patrick's Resignation	131
Restoration of Peterborough Cathedral	132
Restoration of Kirk Bradden Church, Isle of Man... ..	132
Rev. B. Maturin	143
Bishop of North China's Missionary Party	144
Presentation of Organ to St. John's, Burgess Hill, by Dr. Withers Moore	144
Church House, Westminster	156
Restoration of Kimpton Church, Herts	162
Sensational Titles for Sermons	192
Professor Margoliouth on Ecclesiasticus	203
The Procession at the Church Congress	204
A Jewish Service in Spitalfields	216
The Roman Church in Cambridge	224
The Edward Thring Memorial	239
Canon Luckock on the Intermediate State	239
The Canonry of St. Augustine's, Canterbury	239
Church Pastoral Aid Society	240
Restoration of Selby Minster... ..	250
Bishop of Winchester on Episcopacy	251
The Bishop of Corea	251
Professor Sir J. Stainer on English Music	251
Church of England Burial Reform Association	252
The Church Association and Defence	252
The late Rev. Dr. Hatch	263, 288
The Mothers' Union	264
Testimonial to Archdeacon Sinclair	273
Commemoration of the Faithful Departed	288
Dedication of St. Andrew's, Wells Street	288
The late Rev. G. F. Howard... ..	297
Examinations for Honour School of Theology at Oxford	307
Church Training College for Lay-workers	312

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300,	312
--	-----

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300,	312
---	-----

The Church of England Pulpit

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 706.

SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1889.

PRICE ONE PENNY.



The Church of England Pulpit.

WALKING BY FAITH.

BY THE REV. W. DONE BUSHELL, M.A.,
ASSISTANT-MASTER IN HARROW SCHOOL.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE SCHOOL CHAPEL, HARROW, ON SUNDAY, MAY 26TH, 1889.

"We walk by faith, not by sight."—2 COR. v. 7.

I HAVE to speak to you of what is indeed a marvel and a mystery. It is our spiritual life. We have an animal life, and even there the structure and the operation of the nerve, the heart, the eye, are marvellous beyond imagination to conceive. We have an intellectual life more marvellous still, through which come revelations whether of music or of reason or of poetry, we know not whence or how, a Hamlet, a Principia, a Messiah; but crowning all, most marvellous of all, there is the spiritual life, by which man, even in his weakness and his blindness, stretches out lame hands of faith and lays his hold on the Unseen.

Let your imagination place before you some great company of men. Suppose, for instance, that from some lofty eminence, some pinnacle of an aerial temple, you can survey the swarming crowds of London, and can survey not streets alone or houses, hats and coats, the clothing of man's life, nor see alone the joyousness and wretchedness, the luxury and sordidness, the humour and the pathos, and the folly and the awe of it, the birth and the endeavouring, and the failing and the dying, but can survey as well the motives which inspire those teeming multitudes as they work out the primal curse or blessing, whichever it may be: "in the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread."

What first of all will strike us? Doubtless this; the overmastering influence of self-interest. Why do these countless thousands work and hurry to

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 706.

and fro, rise early, push the weaker on one side? It is to get for themselves, get money, which means food and shelter, and the decencies and the refinements and the possibilities of fuller life. But you will have looked a very little way if this seems all; for everywhere, combined with this self-interest, you will find, I do not say self-sacrifice, which is—perhaps—too great a word, but self-restraint and even self-surrender; and that not for the coward fear of others, which keeps the very ant from trampling on his neighbour on the hillock, but voluntary, self-imposed; not one man here and there, but countless thousands do the things which selfishly by nature they would not do, and do not the things which selfishly by nature they would do; the lower self in various degrees is subject to the higher; and it is because man lives by faith.

And now I want to ask you plainly, faith in what? And we are here at the foundations of all true living, and therefore let our words be sober and without exaggeration, and sincere.

First, then, we answer, Faith in righteousness. That is the common bond of union which unites the Catholic, the Protestant, the Atheist, the Deist, the Trinitarian, the Agnostic, and makes them capable alike of noble living. The faith in righteousness. We *know*, know in a more real sense than we know anything else whatever, that honesty is better than hypocrisy, purity than filthiness, truthfulness than lying. Nay, better, do I say? We know that between such things there is a great gulf fixed. How do we know? That I know not. I could, of course, give you a name for this same knowledge, could call it the moral sense or what you will, but that is a small thing; what is important is that it is there. Man lives by faith in righteousness; and, mark you, it is a faith which even of itself has a redemptive power, and can prevail to mould a life; it is a faith in purity which can empower a man to curb his foul imagination when no eye can see him in the darkness and the solitude; it is a faith in truthfulness which wrings from him the shameful story of his own deceit, which never need have seen the light of day; it is a faith in human brotherhood which makes him scorn mere idleness, and give himself to help the weak.

And one word I have not yet mentioned, though I think that you will have been expecting it. That word is God. Nor will I mention it as yet. No, we are speaking, as it were, to the very Atheist, who believes that there is no God, and we can so far only say to him and to all alike, "My brother, are you honest, humble, loving, truthful, pure? If not, let there be no mistake about the matter, you are lost. We do not say that you are going to hell; we do not now say that there is a hell at all; but we do say your life is a lost life, your soul is a lost soul, for it has gone astray and missed its only perfecting; it has refused to hear the voice of the Eternal, crying out in it upon the side of righteousness, and daring it to disobey on penalty of forfeit of true living." Yes, broad and deep as our humanity itself are the eternal sanctions of the right and wrong. Why right is right and wrong is wrong we do not know; but right *is* right and wrong *is* wrong, and will be so to-day, to-morrow, and for ever. That is the fundamental faith by which men live. Let Calvary be but a tale, let heaven be emptied of the Father, yet the moral law remains firm, verifiable, self-witnessing. "Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal," so wrote the finger of God, they tell us, in the old time on the stone tables of the law, so certainly is written ineradicably upon the fleshly tables of the heart of man; and so he ever lives by faith; and so, remember, life can never be to him when he is true to himself an easy satisfying thing, it needs must be a struggle and a repressing, and if it issue in success a victory. No, even apart from God, his conversation must be, I have no other word for it, in heaven.

But now comes in the thought, the supreme and sacred thought, of God. And at the very word a stillness and an awe falls, or should fall, upon the soul. It might be faith in good alone which leads these sufferers and these toilers and enjoyers, whom we pictured to ourselves, to refuse the evil and to choose the good. It is not so. They do not doubt, you do not doubt, that there is an Eternal Eye which sees them and an Eternal Heart which follows them with love; nay, an Eternal Father, and that Father one of whom the Universe itself is but the vesture and the veil. Him we call God, and when the heart awakes to recognise that He is there, is not content to learn about Him in some catechism, but reposes consciously upon His Fatherhood and His infinity, then does that faith by which a man may live gain strength and volume and intensity unknown before. He calls, it is a personal call, and we obey, or if we obey not there arises a remorse which is itself the very strongest witness to His presence and His claims. A faith in righteousness is strong, a faith in God is stronger. It was the glory of the Jewish race, not that at one time in the annals of their history a pillar of fire is said to have gone before them on their way; not that the walls of Jericho

were said to have fallen down before the trumpet-blast of Israel, or that the priests had passed dry-footed over Jordan, or even that Jehovah had once spoken openly with Moses upon Sinai; but that that marvellous race was, as no other race I know of Greek or Roman or Barbarian, filled entranced, nay, shall we even dare to use the word, inebriated with the thought of God. This was their revelation, this their contribution to the fuller faith of the human race, this the exceeding value to us of those Old Testament writings which you study Sunday after Sunday in your schoolrooms, or at home. "My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God." "O, God, Thou art my God, Thou art about my path and about my bed, and spiest out all my ways." Almost each verse of the old Hebrew Psalter, which in its marvellous beauty and in its undying freshness speaks, as no other words can speak, the language of the soul, bears witness to that deep sense of God, His Presence and His Holiness, which, when at last it grew into a recognition also of His perfect Fatherhood, became the strong foundation of that Catholic faith which has inspired and purified the world, and shall inspire and purify it unto the end. "My soul wait thou still upon God, for of Him cometh my salvation." Yes, when with one accord, one voice, one gesture, as is befitting, we declare that "we believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," we claim to share a larger, fuller faith than faith in righteousness, one which not only gives to life an aim and purpose as does faith in righteousness, but one which fills it with the warmth of personal love, which makes devotion possible, and giving to the soul the power of speech enables it to pray.

And is this all, this faith in righteousness, this faith in God? No, thirdly, there is faith in the presence of Jesus Christ. Beyond this we will not go to-day: we will not speak of the full Catholic faith in the Atonement and in the ministrations of the Church; nor do we even now say faith in the Divinity of Jesus Christ, that is a question for theology, but in the abiding presence and power of Jesus Christ; that He is present, that we can speak to Him, that He can hear and help and save; that He who hung on Calvary is near us now and holds us by the hand and strengthens us, or if He pleases makes us partners of His sorrows.

And how do we know that this is so? It is the teaching of these weeks which come between the Easter festival and Trinity. They teach us how that, now to one now to another, now to Cephas, now to James, now to five hundred brethren at once, and on the Mount of Olives and in the upper room at Pentecost, Christ did in some way give that full assurance of His abiding Presence which made the coward brave, the faithless confident, the Catholic Church a possibility. And if you want to measure the fulness and the intensity thus given to the faith of men, you have but to compare

that cold and cheerless faith however real of which we spoke at first, and which we gladly own can even survive the loss of a belief in God and immortality, that faith so strong indeed and yet so cheerless, so bereaved, and which though it can do great things does them but hardly and but rarely and but sorrowfully, with jubilant triumphant faith words like that of the Apostle of the Gentiles, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation or distress or persecution or famine or nakedness or peril or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him who loved us."

And can we rise to such a faith, we who have seen no visions, we who were not with Mary Magdelene in the garden, we who have not walked to Emmaus, we who have not stood on the mountain side in Galilee? Perhaps it is less easy for us, and herein may be our trial; can we be faithful with less light, can we be of the blessed who have not seen and yet have believed? Perhaps it is less easy for us, and yet assuredly we have what the early Church had not, we have the story of the faithful, how in his turn each took the Master at His word and found it true; we are the latest born of the Church Catholic, behind us are its centuries of effort and of victory.

But be this as it may, depend upon it that although faith is the gift of God, yet no faith will be yours unless you will yourselves have it so. No man can see who will not open his eyes, no man can hear who keeps his fingers in his ears, the muscles left unexercised will not grow strong, and so it is left to us to a great extent to realise or not to realise Christ's presence. The man who is content with a low view of life will not see by his side the sacred vision of the Crucified. The man or boy who makes use of his talents only as Balaam did to earn reward by them, he will not see it; indeed he will scarcely even see athwart his way the warning angel of the Lord. Nay, further, to an age like that in which we live, which seems to think that it can do great things without being morally great at all, we cannot perhaps expect the recognition of that Sacred Presence will be very fully given. For it is rather the reward of self-surrender and unworldliness and prayer, of purity of heart, of singleness of eye; "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God."

Remember, therefore, when you hurry through your prayers, or it may be omit them altogether, when you spend Sunday reading silly novels, or talking silly talk, you—like those older than yourselves, who give such times (meant for Divine refreshing) to dinner-parties or lawn tennis—are by your own act putting away from you that fuller faith which is the true life of the world. For indeed it is as in the Holy Eucharist, where Christ is verily with us, but it is left to us to feed on Him or not.

And so I have spoken to you of the world's faith;

the faith in righteousness, the faith in God, the faith in Jesus Christ. Yes, these are its royal hopes, these the expression of its longing and its trust. A hope, a trust, you say—no more? And yet what would you have? Would you have certainties so clear as to compel you and not lead you Heavenwards? Perhaps. But would such certainties be best for you? Or would you in your heart have some assured negation which might justify your selfishness? You have it not. No, there remains for all true living that triple faith and all that it involves, a faith and *not* a certainty, a faith not given to all, and yet a faith which is none other than the world's renewal, which gives the young man in his strength an aim, a leader and a battlefield, which brings to the bedside a present comfort and a future glory, a faith by which man even in his weakness and mortality can yet prevail to gain the victory in this life and to defy the grave.



LESS THAN ALL—NOTHING.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS JESSOP, D.D., RECTOR OF SCARNING, EAST DEREHAM, AND LATE HEAD-MASTER OF KING EDWARD SCHOOL, NORWICH.

SERMON PREACHED IN SCARNING CHURCH ON SUNDAY, MAY 26TH, 1889.

"And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the Gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life. But many that are first shall be last; and the last first."—ST. MARK x. 29-31.

A RICH young man had come to Jesus in some great distress of mind. He had evidently been awakened by the preaching of our Lord, and had got to see that he needed very much more than he had as yet found. Distressed, anxious, and ill at ease, the words of Jesus had come home to him, and he could not rest where he was. As far as the good things of this life went he had all he could desire, all that money could buy, all that wealth and position could bestow. But then there was a life beyond, there was a higher life of grandeur, of mystery, and of glory of which he had just heard, and of which a voice within him told him was the one thing needful. To know God in His holiness, in His love, to know Him as a father with whom, in some profound sense, he could hold communion—that he yearned for, and till he could attain to that he despaired of peace. "Nearer my God to Thee! Nearer to Thee!" that had begun to be his earnest prayer. Perplexed and unquiet he comes to the Lord—and kneels at Jesus' feet. "Good master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" The answer seems simple,

yet it was very searching. "Obey God's law; keep the commandments." "Master, all these have I observed from my youth." The poor lad had never done much harm; he had been true, why should he slander and bear false witness? he had been kind and gentle, why should he slay and injure? he was rich, why should he steal? he had abundance of all things, why should he covet? he had been brought up wisely and carefully, why should he blaspheme and break the Sabbath? To these and other evil courses it would seem that he had never felt any strong overpowering temptations. But there was still the unsatisfied heart, still the distressed conscience, still the sense of emptiness, without the sense of an abiding fulness anywhere; still *that* life seemed so far from this, and God's holiness so far above him, and removed from him by a gulf which seemed hopelessly impassable. Then Jesus turned his eyes upon him tenderly once more. Did he really so intensely long to draw near to God; did he really hunger and thirst with all the craving of his soul for that eternal life which he had begun to look upon as the one thing needful? If so, what price was he prepared to pay for it? Of course, the young man would have replied if the question had been put in that form, that he would give anything, anything, anything in the world.—Anything? But would he give everything? there was the point. Was he really so deeply and entirely in earnest that he had come to see not only that eternal life was very very needful and supremely desirable, but that it was the one thing needful.

One thing thou lackest,—one thing, only one; go and sell all that thou hast, and let it all go; and then bare and beggared come and follow me!

It was a very hard condition—how hard for that young man as yet. Without a word, his heart dying in his bosom, he turned and went his way. Hereupon Jesus gave His followers this warning. How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven. "What!" thought His followers, "only the poor and needy then? Are they the only ones who have any part in the Gospel?" Nay! says our Lord, I did not say that; how hardly shall they who *trust* in riches, who allow their riches to be their hindrance, and to bind them down to the earth earthy. How hard for *them*! Hard, yea! impossible. Impossible except by special grace of God's spirit, impossible if it is to be only a matter of their own strength and their own resolves. Hereupon St. Peter—always foremost and always ready to rush to a conclusion, with characteristic vehemence and unwisdom—seems to have been rather elated at the new view which he fancied he understood, and which it seems pretty certain he was quite misapplying. "Lo!" said he—"Lo! we have left all and have followed Thee. We have made some sacrifices; we have given up that lucrative fishing trade on the lake—the boats, and the nets, and the slaves, and the money-making,

the partnerships in the flourishing business. Well, we don't regret it. By-and-bye there's a kingdom coming, and thrones, and office, and power. Who knows what sort of future may not be before us?"

"You did well! says our Lord. No man makes a great sacrifice for my Name's sake who shall not receive his reward. Even in this world he will find his return—he will find some precious equivalent for all that he has surrendered: content for discontent, new love for old, sympathy, trust, peace of mind instead of past disquiet and cares, the losses, the sleepless nights and the anxious days, the petty disturbances, and the troubles, and the jealousies, and the suspicions that once were so frequent and common: but though his return be a hundred-fold greater than his sacrifice, yet he must prepare for his trial too; the life my servants lead is not to be all restful ease, painless and free from peril; they shall receive a hundred-fold, but with persecution, the furnace of affliction in some sense or other is to try them, and it is vain for them to look for my crown without my thorns."

"But as for you who are inclined to pride yourselves upon what you have given up for my sake, and to count yourselves on a higher level than him who has just gone from my side. It may be that the day is coming when he, too, shall come back, and throw in his lot with me. It may be that, even now, he is in a more hopeful condition of mind than you. You are content with yourselves, and proud at what you have given up. He is very sorrowful and humbled at the thought of what he retains. Take heed! He may yet far far outstrip you in the race. You who still dream of an earthly kingdom, and a life which, if it ever existed, would not be the eternal life at all. He has already some dim vision of the higher life which you have heard of, but as yet cannot be brought to understand. Your hope in the future is to arrive at the point he has already attained to. Happy if then you can lead him back to my side; but, take heed! Many that are first shall be last, and the last first."

Now observe that in this story there is nothing whatever to warrant the baseless notion that poverty is in itself an advantage, and that poor people are more favourably placed for embracing the religious life than rich people. It is hard for them that have riches to enter into the kingdom of heaven; but so it is hard for poor people too; it always has been, it always will be. But the difficulty is different in the two cases. It is hard for a rich man to give his heart, and thoughts, and love to Christ, because he has so much to attract him from the outside. But how can the poor man be said to have an easier course? Are poor men more content than the rich, more satisfied to remain as they are, more inclined to be gentle, honest, pure, true, and forbearing? Alas! History has had stories to tell of all classes: and the needy have sins to which they are tempted just as much as the

affluent. Worldliness and covetousness, cruelty and bitterness, lust and lying are not sins that are peculiar to the higher or the lower orders.

Peter, proud of his trumpety sacrifice of those fishing-smacks and their tackle, showed the spirit of self-righteousness plainly enough: and James and John, begging for the place of honour when the kingdom should come—begging to share the grand viziership between them when Jesus of Nazareth should sit as Sultan upon His golden throne—betrayed the real worldliness that there was still at work in them, the heaven that was not cast out, nor was likely to be cast out till their idle dream of earthly sacrifices for their Master should be dispelled by His death upon the cross. Then, and not till then, they learnt the real meaning of their Master's word; then, and not till then, did they understand how that young man had been nearer to eternal life than themselves, and that even when he went away so sadly, he was likelier to come back than they to stay.

No! No! It is not a case between rich and poor in this world's goods—it is the question between giving up all our hearts to God, or only part of them; all our life, or only the dregs of it. Let Ananias and Sapphira only be allowed to keep back part of the price, and the Church of God would be soon crowded with those who would be for ever making easier and easier conditions, till at last not all would be surrendered, but nothing! Jesus asks for all, and can never be satisfied with less; and they who would be one with Him, and are hungry and thirsty for eternal life, they themselves will find, sooner or later, that it is hardly worth their while to sacrifice anything unless they are prepared at His bidding to sacrifice all.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the Bishop of St. Asaph asserts his independence, as in other things, by travelling third-class throughout his diocese.

THE Bishop of Southwell, at his diocesan synod held last week, announced that he had petitioned her Majesty to appoint a Suffragan-Bishop for that diocese.

ALTHOUGH the Bishop of Truro's health is beginning to show signs of improvement, says the *Western Morning News*, his lordship's progress towards complete recovery must probably be slow. Dr. Speechly, the Bishop-Commissary, has therefore authorised the use of the subjoined prayer:—"O God, heavenly Father, Who by Thy Son Jesus Christ has promised to all them that seek Thy kingdom, and the righteousness thereof, such strength and protection as may support them in all dangers, and carry them through all temptations, look with the eyes of Thy mercy upon Thy servant, George Howard, our Bishop, now visited with Thine hand, and if it be Thy good pleasure, restore him to his former health; that he, being ready both in body and soul, may cheerfully accomplish those things that Thou wouldst have done; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen." The use of this prayer is authorised at matins, evensong, and Litany, as well as recommended at family and private prayer.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.

ELECTROPATHIC BELT

FOR
RHEUMATISM

Major BAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co., Ltd.

Only Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 6, 1889.

"THE FIXED CLERGY."

THERE is no matter which calls for more determined and prompt action at the hands of reformers than that of the enforced permanency of our clergy in their parishes. According to the present practice, a man entering upon a living is, to all intents and purposes, doomed to remain in it for life, unless he be one of the more fortunate of mortals. He may wish to exchange, but no sooner does he seriously take up the matter than he finds himself face to face with unnumberable difficulties which, in the long run, often prove almost insurmountable. If he cannot get promotion, he is then able to choose between giving up his country living, or being relegated to it for life. Of course in this matter, as in most, there are two sides to the question. Our Nonconformist brethren loudly protest against the principle in vogue amongst them of frequent moves after short periods of labour, and earnestly envy the comparative permanence of the English clergy; but although there are in truth many advantages to be derived from change of scene and change of work, etc., both to pastor and people, there is, it must be confessed, a great deal of difference between the six months or year which is a common stay among Nonconformist friends, and the thirty or forty years or lifetime of many of our own clergy. Men, on the other hand, complain that the clergy, living as they do amongst their people, get to know their wants and circumstances, and their influence is therefore greatly increased. It is alleged, too, that when a man knows that he is going to remain in one place for an indefinite period, he does more to benefit and to gather round him

those amongst whom he lives. Whilst all this is true, we cannot but feel that the balance is strongly in favour of the opposite scale, for the result of experience is that after several years work in one parish the majority of men gradually lose that vital energy which is absolutely necessary for the due working of a parish. Nor can we for a moment doubt this, since it is invariably the case in all other occupations that continual attention to one thing, unrelieved by frequent change, tends to enervate rather than invigorate. It is, however, a painfully true fact that there are practically no facilities given for exchange of benefices in our own Church. Yet we recently heard a prominent ecclesiastic say that to his mind ten years in one parish was long enough for any man. How are these two facts to be harmonised? The matter has been taken up by a few diocesan conferences. Ought it not to be made a matter of further effort?

NÎMES AND THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

LANGUEDOC, in Southern France, possesses few, if any places of greater interest than the old Roman city of Nîmes, with its important antiquarian remains and associations. Neither Avignon, Arles, Carcassone, or Aiguesmorte, can surpass, if indeed rival Nîmes, in the variety and value of its historic monuments. Hence this spot is one specially visited by the traveller and the student of the past.

An additional subject of interest, in connection with Nîmes, is now afforded by the zeal in the promotion of Peace and International Arbitration, which, during the past two years, has been manifested by a number of its younger citizens, who have constituted themselves into an organisation bearing the designation of "The Nîmes Association of Young Friends of Peace," the active membership in which body is limited, by rule, to persons under twenty-five years of age, although the honorary adhesion, or actual co-operation, of those of riper years, is not excluded. But, for the most part, this Society consists of young men of the city and district.

This Association was founded in 1887, chiefly through the exertions of M. L. A. Barnier, of Geneva. Its honorary President is M. Frederic Passy, Member of the French Chamber of Deputies. The three Secretaries are M. J. Prudhommeaux, M. J. Dumas, and M. Ch. Toureille, all of Nîmes, where the office is situated, at 11, Rue Bourdaloue. Ladies are admissible as honorary members of the Association, and amongst those we observe the names of the Countess de Gasparin, Miss P. H. Peckover, of Wisbeach, Madame V. G. Traut, Madame Gœgg, and others.

Ordinary membership involves a very moderate annual subscription, and adhesion to a programme, the extreme simplicity of which is a noteworthy

feature. It states that "the objects of the Association is to labour, by all means, for the establishment of universal and permanent peace," and, in particular, "for the institution of an International Tribunal of Arbitration, furnished with a special Code; for the suppression of standing armies and for the establishment of national militia, in order to ensure internal order." The active members meet once a fortnight. Quarterly meetings are also held, at which the presence of honorary members is welcome.

These young men of Nîmes are, themselves, in a position to speak feelingly, and from practical experience, in reference to the evils of militarism. For not only are they and their friends sufferers from the burdens of the immense war taxation of their country, but they are also, in turn, rendered the victims of the Conscription, that cruel system, which in France, as in other Continental countries, exercises such a mischievous and deadly influence upon the moral and intellectual progress, and the pecuniary interests of the youth of the nation. In certain instances this oppressive exaction has been found so intolerable by the young men of Nîmes and its vicinity, that some of them have been obliged, though most reluctantly, to forsake their beloved homes and relatives, and, by means of emigration to America or elsewhere, permanently to exile themselves from their fatherland. The presence of such circumstances tends to give peculiar sincerity and earnestness to the peace efforts of the Nîmes Association.

The Nîmes Association has prepared a comprehensive Manual, or Almanac, containing a choice selection of extracts from the best French writers and orators, in favour of peace and in denunciation of war. Amongst the authors thus quoted are MM. Victor Hugo, Jules Simon, Michelet, Desmoulins, Grand Rabbi Isidor, A. Franck, Charles Lemonnier, Frederic Passy, Charles Toureille, Henri Babut, M. de Rienzi, M. Edouard Laboulaye, M. Dumas, C. Flammariion, Benoît Germain, S. de Braza, Abbé Garande, J. D. Faucher, and others. Being written by Frenchmen for Frenchmen, and in full harmony with the national interests, feelings, idioms, and styles, these extracts will be eminently suitable for distribution at the Exposition, and, indeed, elsewhere in France.

There is just one point, however, to which it is to be desired that more prominence may be given in the future addresses and publications of this useful body of workers. We allude to the primary importance of Christian principle as the basis of the best Peace effort. But with this single exception, the good work at Nîmes is scarcely open to criticism, and merits the approval and friendly appreciation of all who are interested in the noble cause of Peace.

We heartily wish success to the continuance and prosperity of this Association of Young Friends of Peace. May their influence become an increasing

power, not only in their own ancient and important city, but also in numerous localities throughout their country; and may their labours and example stimulate many young people, and elder ones also, in other districts, to establish similar praiseworthy organisations.

MOSES AND OTHER ANCIENT LAWGIVERS.

BY THE REV. HENRY G. CARROLL, M.A.,
INCUMBENT OF GLASNEVIN, DIOCESE OF
DUBLIN.

A PAPER READ AT THE MEETING OF THE DUBLIN
CLERICAL ASSOCIATION, ON MONDAY, 3RD
JUNE, 1889.

IN my paper to-day I purpose to compare and contrast Moses with other ancient Lawgivers. With this object, I would ask your attention in the first place to certain points connected with Moses and his writings, and then I shall briefly review some of the most remarkable systems of legislation of old, both in Eastern and Western lands. The originality of the Mosaic teaching and ordinances is a striking feature of them, and this will appear more evident when we consider the circumstances of the early life and education of their author. Though born in Egypt, he was the child of an alien race; and though he is said to have been "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," his mind seems in no wise to have been influenced by it, for the code of the Pentateuch is an open revolt against that wisdom which consisted mainly in gross and debasing superstition and idolatry. It is important to observe this, because it has sometimes been asserted that several of the Mosaic institutions were derived from those of Egypt. The monarchical government of Egypt had received in the days of Moses a complete development; each succeeding Pharaoh was regarded as a god upon earth, and the dispenser of benefits to his people. Moses proclaimed a monarchy to his nation, but of what kind? A theocracy of the strictest character—Jehovah himself is the only king of Israel. He is the supreme Judge, the supreme Law-giver; and if we adopt the threefold division of the Law of Moses, as we find it so comprehensively set down in the 8th Article of our Church—viz., Ceremonies and rites, Civil precepts, and Moral commandments, we shall find that all have a direct reference to the one living and true God. As to the Ceremonies and rites, I do not now speak of their prospective import in reference to the day of Christ, but—look at them as regards Jehovah Himself at the first—burnt-offerings and sacrifice for sin were calculated to impress the minds of the people with an abhorrence and a dread of sin as an offence against a righteous God: "Be ye holy for I am holy," was at once a command and a revelation.

In the Civil precepts the supremacy of Jehovah is maintained. To notice only one or two instances, see how it was as concerns the possession of the people's land and the institution of the year of jubilee. "The land is mine," says God, "and ye are strangers and sojourners with me." As to "the Commandments which are called Moral," we find the Decalogue prefaced with the declaration "I am the Lord thy God"; and in

many other portions of them there is the repeated declaration, "I am the Lord."

Then as to the sanctions of the whole law—they are of a temporal character. Jehovah ruled directly as a king; obedience to His command was rewarded by an immediate blessing, disobedience punished by an immediate curse. There is no distinct reference to retribution in a future life—here again we see a difference between Moses and the wisdom of Egyptian theology in which he had been instructed; in that theology the life of the world to come was largely dwelt upon, and of this we have evidence still in the mysterious hieroglyphic representations of that wonderful country. Many of you will doubtless remember here Bishop Warburton's famous attempt to prove the "Divine legation of Moses" from this remarkable omission in the Pentateuch, inasmuch as other ancient laws directed men's thoughts to a life beyond the grave with its rewards and punishments. The Bishop argues that none but a divinely given code of laws could maintain its ground without such a reference. Running parallel—if I may so speak with the laws of the Pentateuch—is the history of the Pentateuch, the account of the Creation, the call of Abraham, the subsequent dealings of God with the Jews; all these matters are narrated with the design of teaching them their duties and their responsibilities.

But I cannot now dwell longer on Moses, my time admonishes me to pass on, to notice other lawgivers and their systems. Let me take you from the land of the Jews to India. In that vast region there has prevailed from remote antiquity a code of laws which is universally venerated and strictly observed—I mean the Manava Dharma Shashtra, the Laws of Manu—but as to the author of them, much diversity of opinion prevails. Manu does not come before us with a distinct personality like Moses. The name Manu, which, as Sir W. Jones observes, seems to bear some affinity to Mene or Minos, was given to each of seven divine personages, who, according to the Indian idea, successively governed the earth. To the first of these, surnamed Swayambhuva, that is, the "Self-existent one," the Book of the Law was supposed to have been revealed to Brahma, and Brighou, a Richi, that is, a holy personage, subsequently made it known; the work, as we now have it, is a compendium of a much more extensive one. It was long traditionally preserved, and then put into verse in its present form—at what time cannot be ascertained—the limit ranging between 1280 and 880 years B.C. To give a detailed account of this celebrated code, would occupy me too long and prove tedious to you. I must content myself with noticing that it contains a great variety of matter—a cosmogony which is wildly extravagant, and contrasts strangely with the Mosaic account of the world's origin; a perplexing amount of metaphysical speculation, minute regulations for the conduct of life and the performance of religious duty, matters pertaining to commerce and military affairs, and an elaborate account of the condition of men after death. "It is," says Sir W. Jones, "a system of despotism and priestcraft—a scheme of theology obscurely figurative—ceremonies often absurd and idolatrous." The four great castes or divisions of Indian society—that is the Brahmin or priestly order, who are said to have been created from the mouth of Brahma: the Kchatriyas, or warrior class, created from his arm: the Vaisyas or merchants from his thigh; and the Sudras, or servile class, created from his foot, are all successively noticed; but the superiority of the

Brahmin is ever upheld. A Brahmin must be the counsellor of the king, held in highest honour by him; the murder of a Brahmin is the most atrocious of crimes, an insult offered to him is visited with the severest penalties; no Sudra can merit Swarga, *i.e.*, heaven, unless by service rendered to a Brahmin. I need not point out the mighty contrast between this and the Mosaic account of the origin of our race. How "God has made of one blood all the nations of men who dwell upon the face of the earth." As to rites and ceremonies, they are astonishingly numerous in the Manara Dharma Shastra; the Mosaic ritual has been objected to as over burdensome, but we may say that "the little finger," of Manu is "thicker than" Moses' "loins." The Mosaic ritual had as we know and believe an ulterior object, "a shadow of good things to come"; no such object is noticeable in the Hindu scheme. There is a merit in sacrifice, and the great and principal sacrifice, the *Aswa Medha*, that is, the horse sacrifice, is so highly esteemed that it is declared if a king should perform it one hundred times he would attain to a rank superior to the gods themselves. The moral precepts of the Manara Dharma Shastra are generally speaking unobjectionable, but there are some notable exceptions, for instance, in the eighth book we read as follows with regard to oaths: "In certain instances he who from a pious motive speaks differently from what he knows to be true is not excluded from heaven, his deposition is called the word of the gods. Whenever the telling of truth might cause the death of a Sudra, a Vaisya, Kschattrya, or Brahmin, a falsehood ought to be spoken, which, in that case, is preferable to the truth."

The doctrine of Metempsychosis, or Transmigration of souls, which prevailed in Egypt, is very fully developed in the last, the twelfth book of the Manava Dharma Shastra. "Souls," it is said, "endued with the quality of good acquire the divine nature; but sinful souls, after having passed many years in the infernal regions, are condemned to various transmigrations, passing into the body of a dog, a wild boar, an ass, a camel, or other creatures, according to the gravity of the crime." Such is a brief outline of that system which has moulded the religion and jurisprudence of Hinduism.

I pass on to another lawgiver and another great code of laws in the East—Mohammed and the Koran. Like Moses, Mohammed is a prominent figure in the history of his people, unlike Moses he is stated to have been illiterate; indeed, he describes himself as "*Annabi allummi*"—the "illiterate prophet"—and, in consequence of this, he claims to have been divinely inspired. But he broke loose from the customs and traditions of his own people amongst whom he was born and brought up. He has the merit of proclaiming with unmistakable clearness the unity of God, and here he and Moses are at one. It is interesting to compare this cardinal truth as it appears in the Pentateuch and in the Koran.

The Jew rightly regards with highest reverence the passage which he is in the habit still of transcribing and affixing to the door-posts of his house—the holy words which contain the essence of his faith, and which read thus in the 6th chapter of Deuteronomy, 4, 5, שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל etc., "Hear, O Israel," etc. In like manner, Moslim set the highest value on that 112th sura or chapter of the Koran, entitled *Alachlās*, that is, "The declaration of God's unity;" this chapter is looked upon as equal in worth to a third part of the entire Koran;

it runs thus (let me give it to you, first in the original, and then in English): *

"Say, God is one, the eternal God, He begetteth not, neither is begotten, and there is not any one like unto Him."

I must remark, however, that when Mohammed said of God, "He begetteth not," he meant to oppose the Christian verity of our Lord Jesus Christ being the Son of God; and so, in this instance as elsewhere, he mixed up a great truth with a great falsehood. We are readily able to ascertain the sources from which the Koran derived its origin. These are, the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, along with rabbinical tradition and Christian Apocryphal writings. The ceremonial laws of the Koran are very elaborate, but contain little with regard to the rite of sacrifice. Its civil institutions are also numerous. Many of them—especially those relating to orphans and minors—are just and humane, and it is worthy of notice that there is on the part of the lawgiver a perception of the superiority of moral and religious duty over mere ceremonial. Take this passage in the 2nd Sura and the 172nd Aya:—"It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces in prayer towards the east and west, but righteousness is of him who believeth in God and the Last Day and the angels and the Scriptures and the prophets, who giveth money for God's sake unto his kindred and unto orphans and the stranger, who perform their covenants when they have covenanted, who behave themselves patiently in adversity and hardship, and in time of violence." The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is taught throughout the Koran, and is earnestly defended against the Kafir, or infidel, who would doubt or deny it. The rewards and punishments of a future life are set forth with every variety of circumstance. The true believers are to have in Paradise—the Garden, as it is called—the Hauris, or black-eyed, ever-virgin females for their companions; they are to recline in cool and shady groves, and drink of wine mingled with the waters of the fountains of Paradise—Cafur—Zinzibil—Salsabil. The portion of the unbelievers will be the torments of Hell, and specially of *Al Hotama*, one of its apartments. "What shall cause thee," says Mohammed, "to understand what *Al Hotama* is; it is the kindled fire of God (*Naro Allah almukadah*), which shall mount above the hearts of those who shall be cast therein."

I have no time to discuss as I should like to do the literary character of the Pentateuch, compared with that of the Laws of Manu and of the Koran; but I may remark, in passing, the tribute which has been paid to the grand simplicity of the Mosaic record of creation, by the most accomplished critic of antiquity—I mean Longinius, himself a heathen and ignorant of the truth of revelation. He calls the Jewish lawgiver *ὁκ δ τυχὸν ἀνὴρ*, "No ordinary man"; and he quotes, as an example of the truly sublime, the commencement of the first chapter of Genesis. "God said," "What?" asks the critic—"Let there be light, and there was light; let the earth be, and it was."

Before I conclude this sketch of Oriental lawgivers and their systems, I must mention the celebrated name of Zarasthustra, or, as he is commonly called, Zoroaster, and that strange and mystic book the "*Zend Avesta*," which claims him for its author, and which is still the rule of life and faith among the Parsees of India. Of the man we know nothing certain; some modern

* In reading the Paper the original Arabic was quoted.

scholars, indeed, have regarded him as only a mythical personage, and Dermesteter, the most learned investigator of the system, has said that "no religious belief in the world has left such poor remains." The theology of the Zend Avesta is dualistic, that is, there are two Gods—one the author of good and the other the cause of evil. Ceremonial observances are enjoined, some of them very revolting to our ideas, and the element of fire is regarded as most sacred.

The vast system of Buddhism, which numbers amongst its adherents so many hundred millions of our race, must be looked upon as a departure from the older religion of India; but, says one who studied it deeply, "Although it presents so many evidences of deep thought, and possesses so many claims to our regard, it manifests throughout the most palpable ignorance, not only as to the facts of science, but also as to the great and essential principles of morality. After all its promise it tends only to increase man's perplexity as to the present, and his uncertainty as to the future, leaving him at last in hopelessness and despair.* Neither the age nor the individual existence of Buddha—or, more correctly speaking, of Gautama the Buddha, Buddha being rather an epithet than a proper name—the reputed founder of the system, is established beyond controversy.

But I must hasten on to the Western world. Amidst the dim antiquity of the first ages of Greece and Rome the names of certain famous Lawgivers are recorded, such as Lycurgus at Sparta, Solon at Athens, and Numa Pompilius at Rome; of each it may be said, *stat magni nominis umbra* for our information about the men themselves is imperfect, and we have not any existing books containing their enactments. We are mainly indebted for such information as we possess, to the charming, though inaccurate biographies of Plutarch, supplemented, in the case of Numa, as you may remember, by the graphic account which is given of him in Livy. Concerning Lycurgus, we are told that he forbade his laws to be committed to writing. Of Solon it is stated that he attempted to set forth his enactments in verse, but, if this were so, we have only the merest fragment left—two verses which are attributed to him. The book of Numa's laws was reported to have been buried near him, and then, after the lapse of 500 years, to have been discovered. It was lost again, and that, finally. Both Lycurgus and Solon directed their attention to the political regulation of their respective states rather than to matters of religious observance. The code of Lycurgus, as we gather from the ancient authorities, was harsh and stern, disregarding moral principle in the most sacred family relationship, and, if we accept the account of the ordinance called the *Crypteia*, his treatment of the Helots or Serfs of Sparta was brutal and murderous. Solon's laws were conceived in a milder spirit, the plan of government which he laid down was based upon the distribution of wealth amongst different classes of his citizens, but his boasted *Seisachteia*, or "disburthening ordinance," of which I have no time to speak particularly, was dictated by a sense of expediency rather than of justice. Contrasting Oriental and Grecian† lawgivers, so far as they

have been noticed in my survey, we shall see how much more largely the religious element prevails amongst the institutions of the former, how inseparably this element is mixed up with the rules they have laid down for the economy of life. Comparing together Oriental and European lawgivers, we find, that in the case of each of them divine assistance and inspiration are supposed to have been afforded. We believe, of course, that the laws under which the Jewish people lived were indeed given by God to Moses, and that by him as a mediator they were transmitted to the nation, but Manu and Mohammed, Zoroaster and Buddha, Lycurgus, Solon, and Numa, are all alike declared to have been under the guidance of superhuman wisdom. There is one man, of the loftiest intellect, on behalf of whom this claim is not, I believe, advanced, I mean the illustrious Plato; he, too, is reputed to have been a lawgiver, and to have composed laws for the Syracusans and Cretans, but of these laws we have nothing surviving. He has, however, bequeathed to posterity two remarkable expositions of his views on the regulation of States; his eight famous Books of the Republic, and his twelve Books of the Laws—works familiar to every Greek scholar, and full of interest as the speculations of a gifted and philosophic mind, but little suited for any useful practical object. One of his theories indeed, as he has expressed it in the fifth Book of the Republic, saps the foundation of social morality. I allude to what he writes as to the community of wives, and as to children being the property of the State instead of the fathers and mothers to whom they owed their being.

Here I must conclude this necessarily brief and, as I feel it to be, imperfect treatment of my subject. To some of you, such a disquisition may seem to be a matter of curious research rather than of theological value. I cannot, for my own part, so regard it. On the contrary, I believe that it is possessed of manifold advantages. In the first place, it will enable us of the clergy to put to silence, not unfrequently, "the ignorance of foolish men." I remember once to have met a gentleman of education and culture, a fellow of his college in Oxford, who held loose views about the Bible and its moral excellence; in this latter respect he was inclined to think it was not superior to other ancient codes of law. "I believe," said he, "there are some fine things in the laws of Manu;" unfortunately for himself he had no knowledge of Sanscrit, and he had not read in any other language the work which he thus praised in such an off-hand manner. In classical learning he was more at home, but I was able to point out to him that blot in Plato's system which we meet in the "Republic," and to which I have just now referred. This of course he could not defend.

There is another advantage which I may mention. The missionary who goes forth to labour in Eastern lands will find himself greatly helped by possessing a competent knowledge of their moral and religious codes. Take the case of the Hindus and Mohammedans. Doubtless there is much that is wild and chaotic in Indian systems; but the Indian mind is acute and subtle, and no attempt to point out the more excellent way will prove successful without an acquaintance with the ancient and venerated code which has been received as the guide of life and the rule of practice. Take again Mohammedanism; every Mohammedan regards his Koran as the supreme authority upon religion, morality, and social duties; and as has been well pointed out by a most competent Orientalist of our day, "the line of argument to be

* "Legends and Theories of the Buddhists," by R. Spence Hardy.

† We may apply to both Athens and Lacedæmon these words of Dante—

"Atene e Lacedæmona che fenne

L'antiche leggi e furon sì civili

Feco al viver bene un picciol cenno."

"Purgatorio," c. vi., v. 139.

adopted by a Christian missionary in dealing with a Mohammedan should not be to attack Islam as a mass of error, but to show that it is based upon Christianity and Judaism—partially understood; *especially upon the latter* (i.e. upon Judaism), without any apprehension of its typical character pointing to Christianity as a final dispensation."

To conclude all, may not we, my brethren, feel our own attachment to our "most holy faith" strengthened and confirmed. When we compare Moses with other ancient lawgivers we may well say that his own challenge remains unanswered. "What nation is there so great which hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day," Deut. iv. 8; and, when we think upon that Law as the appointed introduction to "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God," we can see in it a grand design, a far-reaching significance, which we shall fail to perceive in any system elaborated by man's own intellect alone.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH."

By Charles Gore, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House, etc. Pp. 424. 1889. London: Rivingtons.

MR. GORE is as fair-minded as a man devoted body and soul to an ecclesiastical party can possibly hope to be. He does not wilfully pervert texts, or adopt, in defiance of the meaning of words, the interpretations most convenient to his argument. For example, he allows the text about the rock of Peter to refer to the personal character, and not to the office, of that Apostle. For him the "mysteries of the kingdom" are "divine revelations," not symbolical ceremonies. And the angels in the Apocalypse are not human beings, therefore not officials appointed by St. John to rule monarchically each his respective Church. But, on the other hand, he deals largely in presumptions and probabilities, which are in reality only guesses, and invariably ventured upon in support of his own ecclesiastical opinions.

He starts with an *à priori* probability—"That Christ intended to found a visible Church" (which all sects admit, even down to Plymouth Brethren); and then assumes, without more ado, the further probability that He also intended to prescribe the outward form which the visible organisation must take and keep, and that He confines His favours so rigidly to the members of this visible organisation, that those outside of it cannot be secure of being in covenant relation with their Head. Mr. Gore, who can avoid a text, though he is incapable of perverting one, apparently forgot that our Lord had, at least twice, described His Kingdom or His Church in such terms as to preclude the possibility of its being any mere outward organisation. It was not of this world; it came not with observation; men could not point to it, saying, "See here" or "See there"; it was within Christ's disciples; it included all who were of the truth.

Mr. Gore having proved to his own satisfaction, *à priori*, that Christ might be expected to prescribe the outward form of His Church organisation, proceeds next, still *à priori*, to show that He might be expected to found it on the principle of the Apostolic succession, which he states as follows:—

In addition to the office peculiar to the Apostles, of being ye-witnesses to Christ, they held a pastoral office which was

intended to be permanent, and which could only be transmitted by persons commissioned by them to do so; . . . so that no ministerial act could be regarded as *valid*, that is, as having the security of the divine covenant about it, unless it is performed under the shelter of a commission received by transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles.

More than a hundred pages of Mr. Gore's work are devoted to these *à priori* considerations, which are mere surplusage, and worse than surplusage, because their effect is to cause the reader to approach the historical evidence with a preconceived idea of what he may expect it to be, whereas he ought to keep his mind entirely open to receive any testimony that may meet him, however unexpected and surprising.

Having got at last out of *à priori*, Mr. Gore addresses himself to the historical evidence. And here we feel tempted to adopt for once our author's own method, and to say that *à priori* we should have expected that one so accustomed as himself to the conduct of historical inquiries would have gone at once to the fountain-head, and have traced the history of the Christian ministry from our Lord, through the Apostles, and the dim sub-Apostolic age, to the period when historical evidence becomes plentiful, and the episcopate appears in full development. But nothing of the kind. He jumps forward to the later years of the second century, and starts with Irenæus. And, having demonstrated what everybody knew, that episcopacy was at that period a fully-developed and established institution, he harks back to the origin of Christianity, and reaches it at last at the 216th of his 351 pages. We recommend our readers to abstain from burdening their minds with the *à priori* division, and also with the history from Irenæus downwards, which is quite irrelevant, and to proceed at once, with ourselves, to page 216.

We have only space for Mr. Gore's conclusions as to the three periods which alone are really relevant to this question:—(1.) That of Christ; (2.) The Apostolic; (3.) The dark period between the fall of Jerusalem and the commencement of continuous Christian history about 170 A.D.

(1.) He concludes from the usual texts (in which, of course, are not included Luke xvii. 20, 21; John xviii. 36, 37), that "Christ founded not only a Church, but an Apostolate in the Church; an Apostolate, moreover, which was intended in some real sense to be permanent. This Apostolic office included all that was necessary to perpetuate Christ's mission."

(2.) In the Apostolic age he finds (a.) this Apostolate existing, as directly appointed by Christ, and possessing as functions a call to proclaim the Gospel, a plenary authority to teach and to govern, and a ministry of reconciliation, including excommunication and absolution, supported by miraculous physical sanctions, all these exercised in a sphere of action not local but universal. Under these are (b.) presbyter-bishops, as ministers of discipline, superintendents, administrators, teachers, and ministers of the sacraments. But, for the confinement of administration of the sacraments to the presbyter-bishops, authorities have to be sought after the Apostolic age. (c.) Lastly, deacons. (d.) A commencement also may be traced of the extension and perpetuation of the Apostolate in the case of James, of Apostolic delegates like Timothy and Titus, and of the pastors and teachers who ordained Paul (Acts xiii. 1-3). At this point our author fails of that perfect ingenuousness for which we were lately commending him, for he says that the last-named pastors and teachers had *presumably* received

Christ's own commission or ordination from the Apostles. The theory of Apostolic succession propounded in this book requires that they should have received some such authorisation, but there is no historical ground for our author's presumption. However, he admits with great honesty two evident facts, which, as well as the last-named, are fatal to his theory, that no clear information exists in the New Testament as to the limitation of the functions of the different orders, and that there is no evidence as to the exact form which the ministry of the future should take.

(3.) Last comes the sub-Apostolic age, during which, as our author says, the Church seems to pass from the light of the Apostolic age through a dark tunnel of almost perfect obscurity into the renewed light of the closing years of the second century. Here Mr. Gore rests almost his whole case on Ignatius, who, whether historical personage or hero of romance, has the honour of being the first instance in Christianity of a thorough fanatic. He takes sad liberties with the poor *Didache*. "The theology which it represents is of a very inadequate nature when compared with the teaching of the New Testament"; it contains "very imperfect doctrinal instruction." If its author could but have had the privilege of a course at Pusey House under its accomplished principal, what a blessing that would have been for the churches of the sub-Apostolic age! However, at this point our author's theory is, that the wandering Apostles, prophets, or teachers mentioned in the *Didache*, who appeared without credentials, who had to be tested by their personal conduct, whether they were true or not, and who must not be permitted to stay more than a day or two in a place, and by all means to be prevented from touching money, were *above* the bishops and deacons of the local churches, and performed all the ordinations required, and whenever they became localised in a place, were permitted to assume monarchical authority as bishops. Being ourselves thoroughly opposed to Mr. Gore's theory, we recommend all to read carefully his 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters, and witness a man demolishing his whole case with his own hands. And let us venture to point out the fallacy at the root of his whole theory. The Church of Christ is not the externally organised body which bears that name, whose membership can be proved by the production of a baptismal certificate, and whose supernatural graces are possessed by all who have a letter of orders. He himself said positively and decidedly in the most solemn moments of His life that it was no such external body. That body itself is the aggregate of all true and virtuous men who may be known by their works to belong to Christ. Let the disciples of the Pusey House abandon their exclusive pretensions, or perhaps those unfortunate heretics and schismatics, over whom they assume such a condescending superiority, may enter into the Kingdom of Heaven before them.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

BISHOP KEN.—THE *TE DEUM*.

SIR,—My attention has been called to "B.'s" critique on my review of Ken's Hymns. I was hasty and wrong in making the Lita the only address to

the Second Person of the Trinity. The *Te Deum* is, as "B." says, a remarkable case in point. But he does not do justice to his own case. In the first place, the *Te Deum* has addresses to the Three Persons. But then it is supposed that they were introduced afterwards, originally it being all addressed to the Second Person. This seems to make for "B.," but really it is on my side, for the introduction is a protest against one Person being alone worshipped. "B." cannot see that Romish doctrine makes all terminate in the worship of a Corporal Presence; or all Eucharistic grace consists in our bodies being in contact with His material Body. But we see this in Bishop O'Dwyer's admirable letter to the Knockee boycotters. He reminds them chiefly of their fighting "in the presence of the awful sacrifice of the Mass." "B." says: "Nor is there any connection between even the most exclusive views of His Incarnation and the gross views of the Eucharist." I do not know what he means by "exclusive views of His Incarnation." I never heard of them. But perhaps he can explain. He speaks of "the extension of our Lord's Incarnation" as an awkward term. So it is, but it is adopted by that party. It means that in the Eucharist our Lord's Body has actual contact with ours, so that His humanity is joined to ours, and so secures our immortal happiness.

YOUR REVIEWER.

CLANDESTINE MARRIAGES.

[We have been obliged to abbreviate this letter; but have interpolated our own words where necessary.]

SIR,—As "your contributor" does not seem to me to have disproved either of my statements, or to have furnished any fresh justification of his own, I am induced to ask for room for another letter which I promise shall be the last, so far as I am concerned.

He says the only point on which he was not quite definite was the question of fees. It appears to me that he was inaccurate on each of the three heads to which I referred.

[In support of his opinion that clandestine marriages are more readily effected at Church than at registry offices, he then says that the Bishop of London is not so competent an authority as the one he quotes, but whose name he does not give, adding an extract from Mr. Flaxman's useful pocket-book, for those associated with registration of births, deaths, and marriages, to corroborate the inefficiency of banns as a method of giving publicity. This we have distinctly asserted, our argument being that the change desired by the Bishop of London would make it a reality instead of a farce.]

It may be the case, as stated by "your contributor," that "not one person out of ten who enters the register office troubles himself to inspect the names" there exhibited; and I feel equally sure that not one person out of twenty who hears the banns read at Church troubles himself, under ordinary circumstances, to listen to the names. A village church may, perhaps, be an exception, for there the veriest trifle is welcomed as a relief to the general stagnation.

Now, as regards the question of fees, "your contributor's" letter sheds some additional light upon the subject, but does not confute my statement that in many poor districts Church fees are as low, or even lower, than those of the register office, indeed; his

arguments seem to me to rather weaken his case, for he admits that the clergy by the remission of part of their fees, which, so far as I know, are not rigidly prescribed by Act of Parliament, have the remedy as regards the comparative expense very much, if not entirely, in their own hands.

[Only as private individuals, not officially. Both registrars and clergymen are at liberty to return the whole or part of their fees; but, as a matter of form, they must receive them, or they would compromise their successors in office.]

Again, "your contributor" writes apparently without knowledge of the formalities to be observed in connection with register-office marriages, when he says, quoting me in part: "A room hired for the purpose, a visit to the parish clerk, is a more complicated proceeding than the mere entry at the register office. No questions other than those prescribed are likely to be asked here any more than by the clerk." If "your contributor" could have six months' experience in a register office I think he would modify his views in this respect. The "mere entry" is not made until every inquiry has been satisfactorily answered, and a solemn declaration made and signed by one of the parties who is previously warned that any falsehood therein will render him or her "liable to the penalties of perjury"; the declaration, in fact, being equivalent to one made in a court of law. I may say briefly that the regulations imposed upon registration officials are so stringent, and any infraction of them so severely punishable, that the clergy would strongly resent having to submit to such restrictive conditions; hence the undoubtedly greater laxity in Church marriages, and consequently the greater facilities afforded thereby for clandestine transactions.

[To permit a false entry to be made in the Church registers as to names, dates, or ages would subject the parties to as severe a penalty as the same proceeding elsewhere; and connivance, negative or positive, by the officiating clergyman would incriminate him also.]

In conclusion, let me beg that I may not be considered as disparaging, for a moment, religious marriage. I believe the *institution* of marriage to be of God's appointment, though not the *form of the contract*. Churchmen rightly regard it as a *vow*, and undertake the responsibility as in God's sight, asking His blessing upon it; but I contend that there is nothing in the Bible which makes this essential, therefore it follows, as a logical deduction, that persons should be permitted to be joined together according to their religious or non-religious convictions, the law of the land taking care that the contract shall be absolutely binding on both parties, irrespective of the ceremonial by which they have been initiated into the covenant.

[As we have already said, non-religious people are not contemplated, nor "the form of the contract"; but it would be hard to find any God-fearing nation from the earliest times who have not considered the recognition of His authority, and the supplication of His favour as essential elements of marriage.]

A REGISTRAR AND CHURCHMAN.

London, 25th June, 1889.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Bankes-Jones, Rev. T. W., Incumbent of St. Thomas's, East-ville, Boston.
 Barnett, Rev. John H., Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Farington, Preston.
 Bowden, Rev. Charles Henry, B.A., Chaplain of Guy's Hospital, Southwark.
 Broughton, Rev. Henry Ellis, M.A., Vicar of Hugglescote-with-Donington, Leicestershire.
 Collins, Rev. H., Mission Chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford.
 Corry, Rev. H. W., Curate of Breage; Vicar of Porthleven, Cornwall.
 Davies, Rev. George D., B.A., Vicar-designate of Marloes; Vicar of Dale, Pembrokeshire.
 Doveton, Rev. W. B., Vicar of Corston; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Bath.
 Ferris, Rev. A. H., Vicar of Charlestown; Rural Dean of St. Austell.
 Green, Rev. P. W., Vicar of Llanwrda and Llansawrn; Vicar of Llywel, Brecon.
 Hull, Rev. Canon Robert B., Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Northamptonshire.
 Hunt, Rev. Robert Falkner, M.A., Rector of Southport, Queensland; Rector of St. Andrews, South Brisbane.
 Knox, Rev. Frederick Vivian, M.A., Chaplain to the Church Missionaries' Children's Home, Limsfield.
 Minton-Senhouse, Rev. Hugh McNeile, M.A., late Curate of Atkern; Rector of Lillingstone Lovell, Buckinghamshire.
 Plumptre, Rev. Charles Pemberton, B.A., Rector of Woodham Ferrers, Essex.
 Randolph, Rev. W. F. H., M.A., Curate of Cleethorpes; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Croydon.
 Richardson-Eyre, Rev. John, Vicar of All Saints', St. John's Wood.
 Rogers, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Thorpe Hamlet, Norwich.
 Shelton, Rev. H. Clifton M., Chaplain of Pentonville Prison.
 Stuart, Rev. William, Vicar of Mundon; Rector of Hazeleigh, Essex.
 Tahourdin, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Twickenham; Priest-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty.
 Thompson, Rev. Charles Gridwood, B.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Leicester.
 Williams, Rev. Charles D., Rector of Christ Church, Brondesbury.
 Woollard, Rev. E. T., Rector of New Ross, Lunenburg.
 Wrey, Rev. A. B., Vicar of St. Marychurch, Torquay; Vicar of Exwick, near Exeter.
 Wright, Rev. William Heber, M.A., Rector of Llandinabo, Herefordshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Archer, Rev. Francis Henry, Vicar of Christ Church, Monmouthshire, at 71, Pembroke Road, Clifton, on the 1st inst., aged 46.
 Bewes, Rev. Thomas Archer, M.A., at Beaumont, Plymouth, on the 23rd ult., aged 86.
 Boycott, Rev. W., Rector of Burgh St. Peter's, on the 27th ult., in the 47th year of his age.
 Braithwaite, Rev. John Masterman, M.A., Vicar of Croydon and Rural Dean, suddenly, at the Vicarage, Croydon, on the 29th ult., aged 43.
 Freeth, Rev. Frederick Harvey, M.A., Rector of Lyss, at Lyss, on the 24th ult., aged 69.
 Harvey, Rev. Richard, Canon of Gloucester Cathedral, and Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen, at College Green, Gloucester, on the 27th ult., in his 92nd year.
 Jeston, Rev. Henry Playstead, M.A., Oxon, J.P. for Bucks and Herts, at Cholesbury Rectory, Tring, on the 24th inst., aged 93.
 Stephenson, Rev. Lawrence, D.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, at Southern Rectory, on the 21st inst., in the 88th year of his age.
 Stewart, Rev. John, Hon. Canon of Liverpool, Rector of West Derby, on the 22nd ult., aged 67.
 Wainwright, Rev. William Johnstone, late Curate of Aspatria, at Linden House, Aspatria, on the 19th inst., aged 33.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

BY THE LATE REV. J. C. NAPLETON, B.A.,
INCUMBENT OF ALL SAINTS', LAMBETH.

SERMON PREACHED AT LEOMINSTER PRIORY
CHURCH, 1844.

[Nearly all the author's manuscripts were burnt after his death, but this course of sermons having fortunately fallen into his son's hands, he is glad to be able to grant the request of many friends, that they should be published as a reminiscence of one who had the rare gift of being able to move men's hearts in a wonderful manner.—J. N.]

"Our Father, which art in heaven."—ST. MATTHEW vi. 9, part.

HOW different must prayer have been in Paradise from what it is now upon the earth. Then man, happy in his immediate intercourse with his heavenly Father, holding communion with Him, and drawing his thoughts from the fountain of life itself, "prayed without ceasing"; life was to him a continual prayer. But sin came in, and digged a deep gulf between man and God; the Fall made the Creator a stranger to the creature. Since then, some among every generation of men pray not at all—they neither know how, nor desire to pray; others speak forms of words called prayers to acquit themselves of a duty, an irksome task which they weary to perform, but dread to lay aside; and others, who have learnt to pray in the school of Jesus Christ; ah, yes! even *their* prayers, the most fervent and earnest prayers they ever breathed, even these preach to us a sermon on our changed condition, on the fall of man and all its attendant miseries.

Do you not perceive this? Listen then to the language of those who have set the brightest patterns of piety to the world; the men after God's own heart. The prayer of one among them is the groaning of a soul overwhelmed by the load of a bitter sorrow: "Save me, O God, for the waters are come in, even unto my soul. I stick fast in the deep mire where no ground is, I am come into deep waters so that the floods run over me; I am weary of crying; my throat is dry, my sight faileth me with waiting so long upon my God." The prayer of another is a cry of distress and terror: "Lord, save us or we perish." The prayer of a third is the painful confession of a conscience smitten by remorse: "O, my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God; our iniquities are increased over our heads, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens." (Ezra ix. 6.)

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 707.

And yet, whatever be the tone of suffering or fear with which the prayer is uttered, happy is fallen man when he can send up a heartfelt cry to his God; happy is he if to that sad confession of his ignorance, "We know not how to ask for anything as we ought," he can add: "But the spirit itself maketh intercession with our spirit with groanings which cannot be uttered."

For you well know, dear friends, that there are times (and they are the saddest times of our whole lives) when you *cannot* pray; when it seems as if you had forgotten the way to the throne of grace, when your mind is so fettered and shackled by your earthly cares and purposes that you can by no effort throw yourself with faith before Him who has bid you cast all your care upon Him. Oh, yes! there are times when one single movement of the heart towards God would calm the tempest that rages within it; when one sigh, not for our worldly troubles, but for our unbelieving dejection under them would remove half their weight; and that sigh, and that movement are denied us.

Doubtless it was some such feeling that passed through the breast of one of Jesus' beloved disciples, when one day, after witnessing the fervent devotion with which his Master poured forth His soul to His heavenly Father, he longed to possess this great privilege himself, and said to Him: "Lord, teach us how to pray." Then the Saviour, the compassionate Mediator between God and His fallen creature, always ready to supply the wants of those He had redeemed, put into the mouths and the hearts of His disciples that blessed prayer of which I have taken the first words for my text; and since that time, for eighteen centuries past, that prayer has been the consolation of every soul which has known the glorious privilege of being able to give to God the name of Father.

But do we really understand this solemn supplication? Do we know how, and are we able to address it to God in the Spirit which dictated it, so that it might be to us a spring of refreshment and comfort in those hours of trial of which I have been speaking? Or is it the case, that, because we have learned it by heart in early childhood, because a pious mother taught our infant tongues to lisp it from the cradle, because we repeat it every day, because the church strives to impress it strongly on our minds at various periods of its majestic service, might it not be that we become accustomed to observe it in mere words, which say nothing to the soul; to repeat it without spirit, without feeling, without life, without obtaining any of those blessings which our Redeemer has permitted us to ask for in the words which He Himself hath taught us?

Brethren, in so painful a possibility, in the fear lest Sabbath after Sabbath I read to you, and you repeat after me, the prayer of our Lord, without its finding the way to your hearts, I have thought that it will be good and profitable for us to consider it in a series of discourses on which I entreat of you to

ask the blessing of God. Not that I am so presumptuous as to pretend to exhaust all that could or need be said upon such a subject. But if I may be enabled by Divine grace to draw from the fountain of living waters but a few drops to refresh some drooping and unthriving souls, if I can convince some that they cannot with any good reason address that prayer to God, and awake in them the desire of being able to do so, I shall thank God for such a measure of success, and shall not have spoken in vain. For the present let us confine our attention to the words I read to you at the beginning: "Our Father, which art in heaven." Who can address these words to God? What do they say to a Christian heart? Such are the questions I shall endeavour to reply to.

O Lord our Saviour we entreat Thee, as Thy disciples: "teach us how to pray." Without prayer our soul is dead; breathe into it that breath of its life, and when Thou hast inspired our prayers, hear them! "Father." That is the lovely name by which Jesus invites us to address God. And who can do this with a sincere and upright heart? Who can address God by the tender name of Father, and at the same time be inwardly conscious of such feelings and such a spirit as he who pronounces that name ought to have?

But why ask such a question? some one may say. Surely God is the Father of all persons. Every child of Adam is a member of the great human family, and is thereby placed under the fatherly care of that God who has "made of one blood all nations of men." Is it not to God we owe our existence? Are we not His creatures, the work of His hands? Is it not in Him that we live and move, and have our being? Does He not make His sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and send His rain to enrich the grounds of the just and of the unjust? Why then may not *all* say to Him: "Our Father." "Our Father which art in heaven?"

Why not, brethren? Ask the question of men themselves, or, perhaps, ask your own hearts. O doubtless, He who made the heavens to declare His glory, the earth to support His creatures, the herb and the tree to fulfil His purpose, and bring forth fruit after their kind, doubtless He created man also that he should be His child and call Him Father. He gave men an understanding that they should know Him, a heart to love Him, and a mouth to praise Him. But if God is the Father of men, it is necessary that they should be His children; that they should have those feelings towards Him which a father has a right to expect from those who owe Him their being and all things. So that when we cast our eyes over the world we should expect to see all the members of that great family carrying in their hearts and in their looks the pure and holy image of their heavenly Father, finding their greatest happiness in knowing Him, in seeking to make Him love them,

in drawing near to Him, in thinking about Him, in imitating His conduct, in obeying Him with alacrity, with cheerfulness, with joy. We ought to see them referring everything to Him, and to His honour, placing Him as the centre around which all their affections, purposes and wishes moved; making Him their object in all their pursuits, in all their life. We should expect and require to see them, these children of the same Father, loving one another always with sincere affection, and practising towards their brethren that goodness, that tenderness, and that charity which their Father so unceasingly testifies towards them.

And is this, in point of fact, the spectacle which the family of man really presents? Let us look both to the things near us and things afar off. Are *they* such children of a good Father whose actions fill the pages of history? Are *they* such children of a good Father who overspread the world from pole to pole, in the towns and in the country, on the mountains and in the valleys? Alas, sirs, when we draw a picture of what the human family ought in reality to be, it seems as if we intended a bitter and melancholy irony of the whole race of man.

O doubtless, God is a Father, and, even in this general sense, the Father of us all! Doubtless He spreads over all His paternal hands which create, which preserve, which protect, which bless, while they pour upon every living soul a thousand and a thousand benefits. But His children! What children! Can they claim to themselves the title; those beings who have denied their Father, who have rebelled against Him, who, like the prodigal son, have separated themselves as far as possible from their Father's house, who love that separation, who live in it without remorse, who shut their ears against the calls by which their loving Father seeks to bring them back to Himself; who, after after having thrown off the yoke of His paternal authority, break through all the ties of *duty* as sons, despise the word of their Father, transgress His laws, seem to take pleasure in offending against Him? Can *they* pretend to the title of children of God, who make even His kindnesses and gifts occasions of outrage and ingratitude, who have defiled and defaced the image of Himself which He had stamped upon their souls, who strive to forget Him, that they may escape the thoughts of His just anger, who are even ashamed of Him; ashamed of Him and of His name when it presents itself to their recollections and their conscience. Say then, can such creatures, who cherish in their hearts a secret dislike as well as fear of the character of God, who at best only feel for Him a cold respect, or an indifference that freezes up their feelings which are all on fire for the world, for its gains, for its impure delights—can such beings pretend with any justice to the title of sons of God? Can they lift up towards heaven those covetous eyes and say: "Our Father—Our Father which art in heaven?"

No, sirs, no! It would be to mock God, to insult His holy majesty. It would be to suppose that the holy and tender God should be contented to find in *His* children feelings and conduct by which you—fathers and mothers who hear me—you would be grieved and angered beyond measure, if you found such in those to whom you gave their being, and whose nurture and support came from your hands. And think you that those rights which you claim as given you by Nature over your children do not belong to God also? Hear His own words—"The son honours his father, and the servant his master. If I am a father, where is my honour; if I am a master, where is my fear?" He requires that honour, therefore, and He claims that fear before He will bestow the privileges of children, and the right to call Him "Father."

And observe, also, that men in general who, for the most part, do not love that mortifying truths should be told them, have plainly declared this truth by their conduct at least, if not by the confession of their lips. They feel, if they would but avow it, that they do not stand in a position to believe themselves children of God, or to look upon God as their Father. All human religions have considered the Deity as a Being who was offended and angry with them; they strove to appease Him by all sorts of sacrifices; but never did the priest who stood by the altar, nor the worshipper who fell down before it, venture to address to God, in the sense of the words of Jesus Christ, that name of Father which implies a state of heart and life very different from what theirs was. And yet further—this remarkable testimony given to man by his own conscience is confirmed in the most striking manner by the word of God. Can there be anything more surprising, and at the same time more instructive, than to hear the same Jesus Christ who taught His disciples to say to God, "Our Father," address to men who were not His disciples, nor wished to become such, those overwhelming words, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father will ye do?" And when these same men said to Him, "We have one Father which is God," He answered them, "If God were your Father you would love Me." And the Apostle Paul preached the same doctrine when, speaking to his Ephesian converts, he puts them in mind of their past lives: "For we were by nature the children of wrath, even as others"; and in the same Epistle gives them those words of cheering sound: "Having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us acceptable in the beloved." What we learn from these passages of the Bible is this, brethren, that in the truest and closest sense of the word we are not the children of God by nature, but become so by grace; a man is not born a child of God, he is made such.

Yes, he is made such; we are all called to

become such, dear friends, we are all invited to partake of the sweet and glorious privilege of calling God "our Father who is in heaven." It was for this Jesus Christ came upon earth, for this He wrought a new creation by the work of His redemption. He alone could teach us so to pray, because He alone has acquired for us the right to call God our Father; if ever, happily, that right should be ours.

Let us now look again to the declaration of His word, which cannot lie; and that no one may deceive himself in the matter, let us learn from thence what ought to take place within us in order that we may become the children of God. "He came unto His own," says St. John, while speaking of the purpose of Christ's coming, "and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him (as a Saviour, with His pardon, with His covenant of mercy, with the new life of faith) to them gave He power to become the sons of God—even to them that believe on His Name; which were born (mark well His words) not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." That is to say, as we just now declared, it is not by the natural birth of flesh and blood that we have power to become the sons of God, but by being born of God—of God's Spirit, by being spiritually begotten of Him as really as a son is naturally of a human father. It is the Bible which again declares: "He hath begotten us by the word of truth, which is the Gospel." And again: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His"; but "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, 'Abba, Father.'"

God grant, brethren, that you may understand and feel these words, for they contain the secret of the life of heaven upon earth. When a man is born again of the Spirit of God, his heart is changed in its deepest and most secret workings, affections, thoughts, desires, will. The man born of God is in truth a child of God—he bears His features. The image of God in which he was created is again produced in him, and with it all the sentiments that belong to a son—love, gratitude, respect, obedience; 'tis a new life, a new creation; the soul has obtained a new tie of relationship to God, and thenceforth it is a fact, as real as it is full of comfort, which is set forth in those words, "Our Father." And is not this an idea, or rather a reality, brethren, which it would never have entered into the heart of man to conceive? What! A creature of a few days, a worm of the dust, able to give the name of Father to the eternal God who fills heaven and earth with the immensity of His power and glory! What! a man—the sinner, guilty, condemned—be enabled by grace to give to the Holy and the Just the title of Father, and consider himself His son? This is a miracle of love and

mercy such as the Saviour only could perform; it is the triumph of His work, the effect of His infinite sacrifice. O yes, and He rejoiced in this fruit of His sufferings; He raised His victorious head from the tomb; He looked forth upon the world which He had left under the load of guilt and the curse, now about to be transformed by His means into a family of God; He saw by anticipation children of God multiplying on a rebellious, accursed earth; He exclaimed to the weeping mourners at His grave, "Go tell my brethren that I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." O you that have been taught by Jesus to know God, see here the spirit in which you may be able to pray like Jesus, to pray at all times, to pray in all your necessities. You are no longer those poor benighted creatures, banished, self-banished from God, or drawing towards Him with trembling as a dreadful Being, unknown in His greatness, surrounded with terrors, and not to be approached in the depths of a vast eternity. No! it is Jesus Himself who, when you bend your knees before God, places on your lips the name of Father—that name so grateful to every natural feeling, which stirs up the gentlest affections of the soul, and whose sound is ushered in by two fit attendants—reverence and love. Is there in the breast any sentiment of pious awe, of generous confidence, of holy affection, of deep thankfulness? The name of Father has a power to rouse them and call them forth. He who prays, then, is a child; feeble, doubtless, but loving, who comes to the best of Fathers to ask confidently all that he wants, certain that nothing will be denied him that is truly for his good.

The Scriptures often put forward comparison between an earthly father and our Father who is in heaven—whatever be the care and tenderness of a parental heart here, they cannot surpass those of the heavenly Father. "If a son shall ask bread," says Jesus, "of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Does an afflicted or erring son find in his father comfort and help. Then too, "like as a father pitieth his own children so does the Lord pity those who fear Him."

The Bible goes farther, the experience of the Christian is still more rich in treasures of comfort. If an unnatural parent has deserted his child, or if death has smitten down an affectionate father, and thrown a deserted orphan helpless on the world, the arms of the heavenly Father are ready to receive him with paternal care; "When my father and my mother forsake me, then God taketh me up." And not for David only is this consoling truth; but for every soul who takes God for his hope and his trust. Yes! The bereaved child may follow the remains of his dearest earthly friend, the father

that begat or the mother that bare him, to the last sad house of all living; he may stand beside the grave wherein are about to be placed the arms that embraced him, and the bosom to which he had so often been clasped, and thus, desolate, feeble and alone, exclaim: "What will become of me?" Ah, may there be one beside him in that bitter hour to whisper the words of God's book; "Wilt thou not say—My Father, be thou the guide of my youth. He is a Father of the fatherless; He is our Father who is in heaven."

But why in heaven? Is not God everywhere? Is He not on earth as well as in heaven? Doubtless. But by introducing the words "in heaven," Jesus intended to raise our hearts, our thoughts, our hopes above the earth, above its miseries, above all that can change, pass away and perish, above life and death. He would thus remind us that if all our earthly supports should fail, if the foundations of the world should be broken up, and the end of all things connected with earth were arrived, God, our Father who is in heaven, above all the ruin and dismay, would be there to receive, to succour, to save us. Jesus wished to recall to our thoughts that we have for a Father Him who reigns throughout eternity, who has made all things by His word, and that therefore every one of His works ought to declare to us His presence and His providence. O, the meanest and weakest of human creatures, if he has become a child of God, may say: "He who created heaven and earth, who fixed the sun and the stars in the firmament on high, who made summer and winter, and causes the outgoings of the morning and evening to praise Him, is also *my* Father. He who adorned this fair earth with all its beauties, who gave the flower its tints and its perfume, who taught the bird his song of joy is also *my* Father. The God who rules the universe of His own creation is likewise my Father—of what then should I be afraid? Poverty and the wants of life? But I have *Him* for a Father who gives the sun his brightness, the earth its riches, the animals of all kinds their food. Should I fear suffering, distress, pain? Nay, but I have Him for a Father who holds in His hand every moment of my life, who can wound and bind up, who can kill and make alive. Is it the loss of those who are dear to me that I dread? the fearful hour when in life I shall see their faces no more? But if I love them in the Lord, they go, like my Saviour, to their Father and my Father, to their God and my God. The hour that is to bring the painful struggle of death, and lay me in the grave, is it *that* at which I should shrink and tremble? No! for my Saviour has taught me to pray to 'our Father who is in heaven,' that I may be assured that His fatherly love awaits me in that better land—my true country, my spiritual home. He wished that every time those words passed my lips I should recollect that I am in banishment, that my hopes, my wishes, and my happiness should not waste themselves in

this dust; but rise ever to God with that prayer."

Therefore, to him who can pray with sincerity: "Our Father which art in heaven," the face of all things is changed that respect life and death and immortality. But our relations with men are changed also—they are elevated—they are sanctified. Observe that Jesus does not teach us to say, each one on his own behalf: "*My* Father," but "*Our* Father." And as we speak these words, we remember with pleasure that we are not praying alone. Whoever upon earth is born of God is a member of that great family of Christ's disciples to which we are united; a new tie, a tie of everlasting brotherhood embraces all the children of God, from the humblest Christian whose whole religious knowledge consists in knowing how to pronounce with sincere affection the name of His heavenly Father, up to the glorified spirits of the just who already stand around the throne. Be thy condition what it will, thou poor servant of Christ, lowly and obscure, unfriended and overlooked by men, thou art nevertheless a member of a great and honourable family. Wherever there is a man who carries in his bosom one spark of love for the heavenly Father, there thou hast a brother who cannot separate you from his interest and his affection; thy warfare is not alone, the path of thy pilgrimage is not solitary, thou dost not pray alone, for everywhere, wherever a soul prays, it addresses itself to its Father and thy Father, wherever Christ is the teacher of prayer thou art included in those words of wide charity: "Our Father which art in heaven."

Let us then remember, brethren, that we can never address that prayer to God in spirit and in truth without laying aside our miserable selfishness. That language of covetousness, that little word "*my*" which is perpetually proclaiming our narrow self-love, my rights, my property, my family, my interest, that language of selfishness has no place in the Christian vocabulary such as Jesus Christ has made it. It is His will that when we pray we should say, "Our Father," and ask for no blessing which we do not desire should be bestowed upon all that are included in that word. Thus it is that the interests of our brethren are *our* interests, their joys our joys, their griefs our griefs, their trials our trials. "If one member of the body suffers," says St. Paul, "all suffer with it."

How different would be the aspect of the Church of Christ upon earth, if the tender charity breathed in this petition filled the hearts of those professing followers of Christ who daily repeat it. To pray heartily for one another, for the best welfare of all members of Christ's Church; for those we know, for those of whom we have heard by report, to pray feelingly for all—what a striking change would it make. The divisions, the party spirit, the schism, the harsh uncharitable judgments, the unkind thoughts, the severe reproachful sentence; where

would they be found, if Christians had the habit of praying faithfully for one another?

Permit me in conclusion to suggest to you a question which I entreat you to consider seriously before God and your conscience. Can you in sincerity, with truth, say to God: "Our Father?" Do these words convey a fact as they pass your lips? do they express your true position with regard to God? your real feelings, your heart? Has God, indeed, become your Father, and do you entertain towards Him the submission, the love and the respect which He looks for from His children? Happy, a thousandfold happy, they whose spirit answers "yes" to the enquiry. For them there is nothing in life or death that can cause a fear for which there is no refuge, or a pang for which there is not a remedy. Oh, let them think with unwearied gratitude on Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvellous light, who has become their Father, and given them the name and privileges of sons.

But if it be otherwise with you, if you have never said "Our Father" in the spirit of adoption, if your conscience forces you to confess that these words in your mouth are a falsehood, from what source then do you expect your happiness, your peace? If God is not your Father, what is He to you? What will He be to you when you appear before His throne? Do not shake off the question in disgust, or turn from it in disdain, do not treat lightly such a matter as the loss of your soul; but give conscience leave to work, and let your reason do its duty fairly.

And yet it is not with words of severity and threatening that I would conclude a discourse built on words so tender and sweet.

In them God does not present Himself to you as a judge, nor as an avenger. He comes to you calling Himself your Father. And if up to this time the threats of His word and the chastisements of His justice have failed to drive you from your sinful wanderings, and bring you back to His fold by that *fear* of Him which is the beginning of wisdom, O let your hearts be touched by the words of mercy we have been considering; let them feel the kindness, if they have stubbornly resisted the rod. We have not called upon you to-day with the terrors of the law; no, we have implored you by the compassion and goodness of God to listen to the Saviour who desires to conduct you Himself to the throne of Grace, to put upon your lips and into your hearts the loving name of Father, to teach you to pronounce with feeling, perhaps for the first time in your life: "Our Father which art in heaven."

And will you refuse to follow Him? Refuse to have God for your Father? Whatsoever you do, the responsibility, the good or evil consequences will rest upon your own heads.

[The rest of this series of sermons will appear in the columns of the PULPIT from time to time.]

"THE LAW OF LIBERTY."

BY THE REV. J. W. KAYE, M.A., RECTOR OF
DERRYBRUSK COUNTY.

SERMON PREACHED IN DERRYBRUSK PARISH
CHURCH ON SUNDAY, MAY 26TH, 1889.

"But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing."—St. JAMES i. 25 (Revised Version).

NATURAL law is that rule or mode of action in which God directs the forces which He has imparted to nature. Spiritual law is that mode of operation which God has appointed in the realm of mind and morals, including man's spiritual nature. In the realm of inanimate matter we see the power or infinite energy of God acting immediately through His natural laws. But God created man in His own image, a moral and spiritual being, and as such he has the power of thought, reason, and choice. Man as a moral and responsible agent is not bound by the inflexible or necessary laws which God may have imposed upon insensate matter. Man has power to adopt, or refuse to adopt, a course of action which God may call him to perform. This power of self-determination, of choosing or refusing, is essential to constitute man a moral and responsible being. Man's moral and spiritual nature is a veritable witness for God and His laws. By the actual existence of man's moral feelings he is led to the conception and belief that in God there are attributes or feelings of the same kind, but in an infinitely higher degree of perfection.

God has made known His laws to man partly by implanting them in man's nature, and partly by revealing them to his understanding. To man has been given a measure of freedom, and from that he conceives the idea of higher and more glorious liberty. Man has been made to taste of the joy of virtue, and from that he conceives the idea of purity and righteousness. Man was created in the Divine image, and from the enjoyment of a measure of the Divine likeness he conceives the idea of an all-perfect Divine Being. Man was thus made to seek for and to attain union and communion with God; for God is a necessity of man's higher nature. It is man's greatest blessing and highest glory to obey God's commandments. God's moral and spiritual laws are mysteriously linked with God's moral and spiritual purposes, and in obeying God's laws we are fulfilling God's eternal designs, but in opposing God's laws we are injuring ourselves. Man's will must be brought into harmony with God's will; then His law will be our delight. But "His own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins" (Prov. v. 22). Men seem to think little of this, but it is an awful truth. A man's sins set into

operation the law of retribution against himself, and apart from Christ he verily must pay the uttermost farthing.

But our text tells us of—

I. *The Perfect Law of Liberty.*—The law of liberty is the antithesis of the law of sin and death. Sin enslaves, but love gives liberty. Rebellion brings bondage, but obedience brings freedom. What must we understand here by "the perfect law of liberty"? Shall we understand the moral law in opposition to the ceremonial, or rather the whole doctrine and written Word of God, and especially the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? The Psalmist, speaking of the godly man, says: "His delight is in the law of the Lord, and in His law doth he meditate day and night." But a certain measure of God's law is implanted in the minds and consciences of men. Cicero describes conscience as "the God ruling within us." It is that faculty within us, implanted by God, which says, "I ought to do," or "I ought not to do"; it is no mere impulse, but it is that moral sense in man which points above to "The Father of Lights with whom is no variableness, nor shadow of turning." All law imparted, implanted, or revealed has its home and fountain in the bosom of God, and the music of its voice is the harmony of the world. To the godly man "the law of liberty" is that new and inward principle of obedience to the will of God, operating in the heart and life, by the power of the Holy Ghost, with the fixity and regularity of a law. The law of God, holy and pure in itself, becomes to us "the law of sin and death" when we fail in obedience; but when the law of God, by the Spirit of Christ, becomes the law of our being, then it is "the law of liberty." The evil spirit of disobedience must be exorcised, and the spirit of obedience to the law of the Gospel of God must be enthroned in the heart. The law of God, to the hardened sinner, is like an iron fetter that closes round his soul, binding it down to the prison of death. But to the repenting and believing sinner, the law of God comes dove-like, brooding o'er the old chaos within him, and renewing and transforming it into a heavenly paradise. The Spirit of God sets us free from the law of sin and death by bringing us into harmony with the mind and will of God. "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," saith the Apostle St. Paul, "hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). The son who is heir to his father's estate does not labour and obey that he may be made heir, for he is already the heir; but he labours and obeys from pure love to his father. His father's will is his law; but it is to him "the law of liberty." So it is with the true Christian; he is no longer under law as a curse or condemnation: the law of his God is written in his heart and mind, and it is his daily delight to obey his Father's will.

Our next thought is to consider—

II. *The Duty of Continuance in the Law of Liberty.*

—“But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth.” Two words here call for our special attention and consideration—“looking” and “continuing.” The word here translated “looketh” does not mean a casual or occasional glance, but an intensely earnest and thoughtful pondering and gazing upon. The same word is used by St. Luke (chap. xxiv. 12), and by St. John (xx. 5), as they describe the anxious gaze of the Apostles bending over, with an effort, and searching the tomb for their risen Lord. Again, St. Peter uses this word in his 1st Epistle, i. 12, where he tells us of the ardent desire of the angels stooping to watch and inquire into the mysteries of redemption—“Which things the angels desire to look into.” Thus we learn that it is our duty to apply ourselves with all seriousness, and yet with all fortitude and zeal, to know the mind and will of God concerning us. We must not read the Word of God lightly and superficially, but with the whole bent of our souls, with deep meditation and earnest desire. Thought and feeling, heart and soul, must be engaged, with oneness of aim, oneness of effort, and oneness of endeavour, to “look into” the surpassing glory of the “perfect law of liberty.” That having our minds filled with one absorbing passion, and our spirits winged with faith and hope and love, we “May be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that we might be filled with all the fulness of God.” But we must not only “look into the perfect law of liberty” to understand it; we must “continue therein.”

It is the continual looking into the Word of God that impresses its sovereign, and saving truths upon our hearts and souls. The Gospel of God is not to be read merely for speculation and controversy, but as a rule of action—a law of life. Our Lord prayed to the Father for those who believed on Him, saying “Sanctify them through the truth.” If the truth make us free, then are we free, indeed. “My Son,” crieth Wisdom, “forget not my law,” but alas, how many do forget. There are far more who carelessly forget the law of the Gospel than who contemptuously reject it; therefore St. James urgeth upon hearers of the Word to continue therein. The angels which kept not their first estate lost their glory because “they abode not in the truth;” but if the angels fell because they continued not in the truth, how shall we escape the just judgment of the Omniscient and Omnipotent Judge of the whole universe. Yet for our comfort the Lord Himself saith, “If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples, indeed.” Oh, how gracious is the Saviour’s call, “Come unto Me, and abide in Me.”

Blessed Redeemer, we come unto Thee; help us to abide in Thee. With this prayer on our lips let us consider

III.—*The Blessedness of Continuance in the Law of Liberty.* “Being not a hearer that forgetteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing.” There are many who sin through heedlessness and forgetfulness; but a godly man hath a retentive and effective memory. We must not be content with merely listening to the Word, but we must act consistently with the teaching of the Word. Hearing with the outward ear only will never suffice to save the soul. God is not well pleased with those that are hearers only. He expects that we shall fulfil His Word by faith and obedience to its requirements. When men are satisfied with hearing only, they are deluding themselves, they are dealing falsely with their own souls. The Word heard must be practised; it must be translated into righteous deeds; it must become the law of daily life. Hear the words of Christ, pleading with those who are hearers only, “Every one that heareth these sayings of Mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man who built his house upon the sand, and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the wind blew and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it” (St. Matt. vii. 26-27.)

But it is not so with the doers of the Word: they are blessed in the doing of it. It is not in our ideas, our intentions, or in our talk that we are blessed, but in our actions, in our doings. Good deeds are the good fruit which a good tree bears. Evil deeds bring misery, but good deeds bring blessings, for “Blessed is he that heareth the word and keepeth it.” My friends, let us not be surprised if we find ourselves deceived, if we find we have been making a mistake. It is one of God’s fixed appointments, both in the material and spiritual world, that “Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap.” The hearer and the doer of the Word is (a) blessed in his obedience; (b) blessed in blessing others; (c) blessed in the liberty of his own soul; and (d) blessed in the hopes and joys of eternal happiness. Is it not a comfort to the weary soul to be blessed with the daily guidance of the Holy Spirit in fulfilment of the Saviour’s promise, “I will never leave you nor forsake you.” Abiding in Christ and in His perfect law of liberty, following Him day by day, cheered by His presence, and taught by His Word, we count all things loss for His sake. It may be that we have to pass through dreary deserts and over barren mountains, but it is there we are vouchsafed like Moses, a Pisgah sight of the heavenly Canaan with its verdant pastures, its vine-clad hills, its mountain heights, its cloudless skies, a land flowing with milk and honey, and still the longing soul would gaze with strained eyes and quivering lip, in view of the New Jerusalem, the City of the Great King, listening to the songs of the redeemed echoing from the towers of glory. Oh, blessed, thrice blessed, is he whose hope is in Christ, whose joy is in the Lord his God.

PAMPHLET and Advice
FREE
HEALTH
 Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to
MR. C. B. HARNESS,
Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians),
 for his *New Medical Work*, entitled
"Harness' Guide to Health,"
 which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harness' Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.
MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives **Advice** (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1889.

CLERICAL HOLIDAYS.

THE dog-days have begun. The rolling stone of the world's holiday traffic has been set in motion for the season by Mr. Cook, and "excursions" for distances varying from ten to ten thousand miles are the order of the day, week, month, or more extended period, as dictated by the means and inclinations of recreation seekers, and more especially of the British tourists who delight in change of air and scene. Amongst all the delightful plans laid out so temptingly, there is one sort that appears not to be as efficiently arranged as it ought to be. We hear of Clergy Holiday Funds, and the *Guardian*, *Church Times*, etc., contain unlimited locum tenency advertisements, both from incumbents seeking help, and from those ready to give it. But there appears to be no definite system whereby every working parish priest may have at least a change, if not a complete rest. Surely, in these days when it is a part of every large employer's recognised duty to cater for the holidays of his workpeople, when Bank holidays are almost always supplemented by a week or even a month's freedom, it is well worth consideration whether the matter of clerical holidays should not receive from the bishops and archdeacons such official assistance as would enable it to be worked on a fair and all-round basis, securing to each wearied mind and body of the flock under their supervision that amount of change which is essential to health, and therefore to the due discharge of the pastoral office. Clerical registries, agencies, and the like, are all very useful in their way; but they are not able to work up to the pitch of a perfectly organised system because they are private, or at most very

limited in their scope. It ought to be "within the region of practical politics" for the bishops, through their archdeacons and rural deans, to be able to offer to all who cannot compass it privately, whether through lack of means or otherwise, either an exchange of duties, with no further expense than the railway fare, or a seaside trip, for periods varying, according to the circumstances of the case, from one Sunday off to four. The opportunity could, and should, be offered to all. A great deal lies in the power of the clergy themselves. The sphere for the young, active and capable man is unquestionably the large town, where he can give back to God the best of that energy and intellectual vigour which have been abundantly bestowed upon him. How often it happens that among the hardest workers are those shackled by claims of kindred or ties of gratitude and affection, which take all their spare cash and make the much-needed holiday impracticable, because they cannot get their Sunday, much less weekday, duty attended to satisfactorily during their absence. Young and middle-aged men such as these, who are being spent among the dense masses of our large towns, have a positive claim to the fraternal charities—we use the word in its fullest and best sense—of their more healthily situated brethren in the rural districts. Every country parson ought to be willing and glad to exchange for, say, four weeks, not less, in the year. It should involve an exchange of hospitalities on both sides, as well as duties. In this matter the clergyman should be as free as if he belonged to a celibate order. The question of children or family and *their* holidays, ought not to interfere. For the sake of the Church and its claims upon him, the priest ought to be able to renew his health and strength once every year, and the freedom from domestic care and the worry of "letters," etc., should make up for any solicitude about the little ones at home. On the other hand, the change of work and unwonted call upon his mental and social capacities would bring its own reward to the country clergyman who can go round his own parish easily in the course of a week or a fortnight, calling at every house. It would be for him a blessed proof that, even if his days of active service were passed, he could still work for a short time in the wider field; and the call would be greeted with joy, since it afforded the means of doing another man a helpful act in the time of need. The great difficulty of exchanges for a few weeks is confessedly the *house*. Complaints are frequently made that it is left in disorder, and that damage is done by the temporary tenants. All this would be obviated, as the officiating clergyman would only be a guest, and the household arrangements could proceed as usual. There are said to be over 23,000 clergy. Of this number it may be assumed that two-thirds live in thickly populated places, or at all events in towns. Of those unable to arrange for themselves a convenient holiday,

we may suppose there are about 8,000, or one-third. All these cases might very well be met, and exchanges effected through the bishops, in conjunction with their archdeacons and rural deans, whose duties ought to involve the investigation of all parishes with an under-staff of clergy; and in the country, the arrangement with the incumbents who were able to effect this too often neglected means of a change which would amply repay both parties. In necessitous cases, too, the holiday fund at the bishop's disposal might be most advantageously applied to the payment of incidental expenses. It is one thing for a friendly rural dean to say to a careworn and impecunious curate: "Mr. Blank, I am sorry to see you looking so unwell. You really ought to take a few weeks' holiday." It is quite another thing for Mr. Blank to receive a *pastoral epistle* from his bishop, saying: "I am very sorry to learn from your rural dean that you are so far from well. Mr. Clayman, the rector of Redlands, in Loamshire, wants to work for a few weeks in a town parish, and I have written to request him to exchange with you. Please find a cheque for five pounds enclosed to pay your incidental expenses, and oblige me by accepting Mr. Clayman's proposal."

BURIAL REFORM.

BY THE REV. F. LAWRENCE, HON. SEC. OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BURIAL REFORM
ASSOCIATION.

PAPER READ AT A CONFERENCE HELD IN THE
VESTRY OF YORK MINSTER UNDER THE
PRESIDENCY OF THE DEAN OF YORK.

THE true principles for the burial of the dead lie in recognising the decomposition of human remains as natural and necessary, and in providing against their becoming offensive to the living. "The fact is," writes Sir John Simon, the great sanitarian, "the human body, once destitute of life, forms no exception to the laws of organic decay. Under the common law of chemical change, the human body dissolves itself into products not less injurious than those of any animal's decomposition; and you cannot take a juster view of the subject, you cannot arrive at stronger arguments in favour of sanitary burial, than by forcing yourself to discard for a moment all memory of the fading human form, and to conceive it a mere bulk of animal matter in a state of decomposition." Such being the true principles for the burial of the dead, in what manner are they to be carried into effect? The cemetery would be sufficiently remote from the city to prevent the probability of a population growing too near it, and would be surrounded by a belt of land totally devoid of resident population; interment would be in well-chosen soil at a depth proportionate to the qualities of the ground, with quickly-growing trees and plants above to assimilate emanations as they arise, and with thorough drainage below, that down currents of air and rain may freely traverse the strata, ventilating and washing the soil,

and diffusing organic matter through deeper levels till their oxidation is complete, and their new combinations are discharged in watery solutions into the drains below; soil, where not suitable for the dissolution of human remains, would be specially prepared before each interment; the coffin would be chosen for its perishable properties rather than for its powers of endurance, that there may be nothing to prevent the purifying and disintegrating action of earth and air upon the body itself; each body would have its own grave. It was Sir John Simon who wrote to the Lord Mayor of London, "No consideration of cheapness can justify the indecency and the danger to the public health of huddling many bodies into one pit; and in a presence which confounds all social comparisons no disrespectful distinctions are admissible." After death there would be no disturbance of the soil until the final disintegration of the body was complete, and the first occupant be fairly deemed to have abdicated its tenure. Instead of family vaults there would be family plots kept as small gardens, where the dead are buried side by side, each in the frailest covering, the earth being ready, generation by generation, as each tenant passes away, to receive the dead for any time to come. The inquiry at once arises—How can the extra cost incurred by such sanitary burial be met? By an alliance between the bereaved themselves, the immediate friends and neighbours, the charitable rich and the cemetery authorities. The bereaved can reduce the expenditure now incurred. There need be no retention of the dead body after signs of dissolution have set in, no special mourning attire, no crape, no funeral trappings, no costly nor durable coffin, no carriages except for the old and weak, no bricked grave or vault, no unnecessary show, no feasting, no treating, no avoidable expense. The immediate friends and neighbours can make the occasion of a death, rather than a wedding, an opportunity for tendering personal service, and making useful presents and gifts of money. The charitable rich can convert their family vaults into earthen plots, set an example of simplicity and economy in every detail of funeral ceremonial, use floral decorations sparingly, and make the provision of suitable cemeteries a special object to be aimed at in the near future, and themselves present tracts of land near large towns to be so used, thus showing forth true practical Christian sympathy with the living, and due respect for the dead. Managers of cemeteries can compel the observance of the principle of temporary tenure instead of tenure in perpetuity. They would insist upon the land being used as a decaying place for the dead instead of a place for their preservation, and thus bricked graves and imperishable coffins would be rigidly excluded, and only such memorials permitted as do not exclude the air from the earth beneath. Thus the entire area of the cemetery is available for use, generation by generation, for all time to come, rendering a new cemetery unnecessary.

THE one essential truth to accept about the Gospel is that no money can buy our salvation, no suffering merit it, no repentance procure it, no holiness produce it. The utmost that our own moral action can do for us—and this, too, is by the grace of God—is to create and enlarge the receptive faculty in us. If we will not take salvation as a gift, we cannot have it at all.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." July, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

PROFESSOR MILLIGAN concludes his series of articles on the Priesthood of the Church by one on the Ministerial Priesthood. In his remarks on the Gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, he follows in all essentials the same line of thought as that taken by Canon Rawstorne in his sermon published in our columns a fortnight ago; that is, he holds that the gifts then bestowed were on all believers, not on the Apostles only. We quite agree. It may be news to some to hear that "In the Service Book, prepared by Archbishop Laud for use in Scotland, the word 'presbyter' was, at least in the Communion Service, always substituted for 'priest,' and the communion office of the Scotch Episcopal Church retains the change to this day."

We have read so many articles about the Galatian Judaizers that we began Mr. Rendall's from a sense of duty, but we soon read on with a strong sense of pleasure. To know one's Greek Testament well, how many collateral advantages it has! Amongst others it enables a man to see what really happened, and to make the past live again. We add some of Mr. Rendall's translation:—Gal. ii. 2, "I . . . communicated unto them that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who were thinking that possibly I was running or had run in vain;" ii. 6, "To me, I say, these men who had thoughts" [*i.e.*, doubts] "made no further communication." Also Mr. Rendall holds that Titus was not circumcised, "Nevertheless even Titus who was with me, had not, though a Greek" [*Ἕλλην ὢν*], "been compelled to be circumcised." Students should make a note of this article in the margin of their Greek Testaments.

The editor tells us in his notice of the late Rev. W. H. Simcox that "he owed much, not only to the teaching, but also to the tender care of the present master of Balliol, who nursed him in his own room for weeks together."

In noticing Mr. Smith's Isaiah in the *Expositor's Bible*, Professor Franz Delitzsch says: "And that he should conclude his book with an ardent prayer to God is like a miracle in our times." No, things are not quite so bad as that, even in this childish, pleasure-loving age.

We do not think much of Mr. Plummer's "Mediaeval Illustration"; it proves just nothing; and, highly as we think of Professor Marcus Dods, we so much dislike articles on living men, that we decline to notice the paper. But the number, as a whole, is excellent.

WE have received from Messrs. Nisbet & Co. the July number of *The Treasury*, an American evangelical monthly. It contains three sermons, and many articles and extracts. It seems more designed for the table than the study, and in that most useful capacity we can recommend the magazine.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the, CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I should go over too much well-trodden ground, and occupy too much of your space, if I were to reply to everything that I cannot agree with in Mr. Donaldson's letter in the PULPIT of the 29th June. But there are some special points to which I wish to reply.

He says (the italics are his) God "is never called the father of lost souls *as such*. The inference is plain. By their conduct on earth they have lost their title to the privileges of sonship."

Did the writer of this passage ever read the parable of the Prodigal Son? No doubt the prodigal had "lost his title to the privileges of sonship;" and yet, while wasting his substance in riotous living, and afterwards while famishing beside the swine's trough, he never ceased to be his Father's son, and, *as such*, the object of his Father's love. This is the *locus classicus* of Scripture on the subject of the Fatherhood of God; and with this before us, no one, unless he has a theory to maintain, can deny that our Lord teaches the Fatherhood of God in its fullest sense.

Mr. Donaldson goes on: "We never read of sonship in hell." Is it altogether without significance that Abraham, speaking to Dives across the great gulf, yet calls him son?

Mr. Donaldson calls it "a flagrantly absurd idea" that the whole human race is *holy*; but a little further on he has answered himself by a quotation from Olthausen, who says: "These roots, or firstfruits, are, of course, the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Because they are holy, their *seed*, the *natural* Israel, must also be holy." It is not maintained that every man of the race of Israel is in himself holy; but if the race of Israel is holy for the sake of the patriarchs, where is the absurdity of saying that the race of man is holy for the sake of the elect Church?

In my reference to Darwin, which Mr. Donaldson does not appear to understand, I meant to insist on the fact that the blessing came to mankind through Abraham and his chosen race; and to state, what I believe to be the truth, that God's election does not stop at its immediate objects, but is intended to make them a blessing to others. If it were in all times and places true that Noah, Daniel, and Job could only save themselves, a Church would never have been formed at all.

As for the charge of being wise above what is written, I believe that a final restoration is expressly taught in the 15th of 1st Corinthians, and many other places. But what if it were not? Our Lord told the Pharisees that they ought to have known without being told, that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living;" and ought to have read the doctrine of immortality into a passage which does not expressly assert it. We are, however, expressly told that *God is love*; and this truth stands in the same relation to the doctrine of final restoration, as the truth that *God is the God of the living* to the doctrine of immortality.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 3rd July, 1889.

SIR,—When the Almighty on one occasion was speaking concerning the "house of Israel" He said,

"What could have been done *more* to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth *wild* grapes." Then He proceeds to say, "I will tell you what I will do to my vineyard, I will lay it *waste*: it shall not be *pruned* nor *digged*: but there shall come up briers and thorns: I will also command the clouds that they *rain no rain* upon it."

In this language three things are observable; first, that He had done *enough* to make the vine bring forth *good* grapes; secondly, that He *could* do no more for this purpose; and thirdly, when it had *resisted* His efforts to make it fertile, that He would *leave* it to its *wasteness*—to the "briers and thorns."

In this we have a representation of His dealings with the human race. He has done *enough* to make them bring forth the fruits of righteousness. He can do no *more*, and when they resist the efforts of His grace He will *leave* them in their wasteness—*spiritual death*.

An examination of the circumstances of the case will convince us of the truth of these remarks. The first and second will be best considered together, and the third will follow from both.

Man, as a guilty creature, requires the shedding of the blood of a suitable sacrifice in order to the remission of his sin; accordingly we read, "for if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself *without spot* to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" And our Church, in language unsurpassed for beauty, richness, fulness, and power, says, concerning Christ suffering death upon the Cross for our redemption, "who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a *full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction*, for the sins of the *whole world*."

Now, in the face of this declaration of divine truth, may we ask what *more* could God do for man in the way of providing a sacrifice? When "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from *all* sin," what more do we *need*? Man, as a creature "encompassed with infirmities," requires a *priest* to intercede for him, and the intercession to be efficacious must proceed from one "who is equal to the Father as touching his Godhead," and at the same time "touched with the feeling of human infirmity." God alone could provide such an Intercessor, and in the greatness of His mercy He has done so, in the person of Jesus the Christ. He is a "priest on His throne." And "because He continueth *ever*, hath an unchangeable priesthood, wherefore He is able also to save them to the *uttermost* that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." What more do we need? What more can God do for us?

Man cannot purify himself; cannot "create the new heart, nor renew the right spirit;" but this is also provided for in the work of the Holy Spirit. "Work out your own salvation, for it is *God* that worketh in you."

Now, as a loving Father and righteous Governor, what more can He do for man's salvation? Why "must He necessarily take any more measures to remove disorder, vice and crime from the universe?" Whence does the necessity arise? Is it because "He is a righteous ruler?" But He has already done *all* that His righteousness requires of Him. And why the universe; what obligation is He under to remove evil from *it*? Plainly, He alone can make known that

obligation. Where then, has it been made known? What He has said is that the "Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His *kingdom* (not out of the universe) all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." "He shall separate (not remove from the universe) the one from the other, as a shepherd *divideth* his sheep from the goats." Those only "who do His commandments enter *into* the city; but *without* (the city, not out of the universe) are dogs, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." These latter had the opportunity during their lifetime in this world of "doing His commandments;" they will never have that opportunity again, hence there is no possibility of their *ever* entering the city. "They are unjust, and will be unjust *still*; they are filthy, and will be filthy *still*."

And this leads me to observe that the three factors of human redemption mentioned above, namely, the Sacrifice, the Intercessor, and the Purifier are potential *now* and *here*; that is in this world during life. "*Now* is the day of salvation." The sacrifice avails *now*; God pardons *now*; the intercession is efficacious *now*; the Spirit sanctifies *now*. If we can have salvation *now*, where is the sense of going to hell to look for it? How awfully incongruous and grotesque is such a notion! And it is *only* here and now that the sacrifice avails. There is no saviour for the lost. God so loved the *world* (of men, not of lost spirits) that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever (of men *in* this world) believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." To believe is to be saved; not to believe is to be lost; hence to be saved *finally* men must *die* in faith in Christ; as I showed in a former letter. It is instructive to notice how much this sentiment of a *present* salvation pervades the Prayer Book. "He pardoneth (mark the time) and absolveth all them that truly repent;" make *clean* (now) our hearts within us;" "that it may please Thee to give us (now) true repentance; to forgive us (now) all our sins;" and so on almost *ad infinitum*. In view of this, would it not be better for some people to sit at the feet of the compilers of our liturgy, and learn lessons of heavenly wisdom, than to try to "darken counsel by words without knowledge?"

In Col. i. 16-20, and in Ephes. i. 10, St. Paul speaks of "all things in *heaven and in earth*" as being brought into one in Christ, but does not say a single word about all things in hell; in Phil. iii. 21 he simply asserts His absolute power over all creation as a reason why He can "change our vile body;" and in John xii. 32, the meaning plainly is that "if I be lifted up upon the cross I will draw all men unto me," meritoriously by my death and instrumentally by my gospel.

It is true that "God is love," it is also equally true "He is a consuming fire" (Heb. xii. 29). This latter is a great "proclamation" also, and all texts must be shown to be in agreement with it; but "limited castigation for beneficent objects" is *no text of Scripture*.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintonia, July 5th, 1889.

EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION.

SIR,—In answer to your reviewer's question, what I mean by *exclusive views of the Incarnation of our Lord*, allow me to say that I used the expression in letter in the PULPIT, of 15th June, in reference to his (the Reviewer's) words, "What share Rome had in thus

making one person of the Trinity exclude the others we will not say."

In characterising the expression "the extension of the Incarnation" as awkward, I do not mean that I think it erroneous to describe the sacraments so. It is quite time that very gross views of the sacrament of the Eucharist may be, and are, hung on to that expression, views which ultimately, and by necessary inference, become destructive of a true spiritual regard of that sacrament. The best corrective of such notions I believe to be a recognition that the Eucharist is a representation of our Lord's sacrifice, not a repetition of it, and, of course, not a propitiatory sacrifice in any sense, as Romanists teach. St. Paul's words, "Ye do show the Lord's death," make it, I think, necessary to regard it as a representation of that death; and all the rest of what he says in the Epistle exhibits it as a sacrifice. One of the post communion prayers sets forth the same. Our Lord's words in St. John vi., verse 51, present the inseparable connection that there is between His Incarnation, His sacrifice, and the spiritual nourishment of His Church, by the continued representation of that sacrifice. The awkward term, *extension*, really contains no error, as it suggests nothing beyond the above.

B.

6th July, 1889.

THE usual retreats for members of the University of Oxford will be held at the beginning of October. The senior retreat will be held at Keble from October 2 to 5. This year it will not be confined to members of the association which organises the retreats, but will be open to other clergy or laymen on application to the secretary, the Rev. J. H. Maude, Hertford College. It will be conducted by the Rev. R. L. Ottley, Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon. The undergraduates' retreat will be held at Cuddesdon on the three days immediately preceding the beginning of the term, and will be conducted by the Rev. M. C. Bickersteth.

THE arrangements for the forthcoming Cardiff Church Congress are on the eve of completion, and the secretaries expect in a few days to be able to issue the list of appointed readers and speakers. Several influential and representative laymen have consented to take part; among others, Lords Nelson, Beauchamp, Halifax, Norton, and Wolmer, Mr. G. T. Kenyon, M.P., and Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P. We learn that an exceptionally strong list of names has been obtained for the two great subjects of "Missions" and "Elementary Education." For the former the assistance has been secured of Sir John Kenna-way, Bishop Barry, the Bishops of Ballarat and Melanesia, and Archdeacon Farrer, and for the latter that of the Revs. J. R. Diggle, J. Nunn, and E. McCarthy, the chairman and vice-chairman respectively of the London, Manchester, and Birmingham School Boards, together with other no less able and competent men.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armour, Rev. Samuel Crawford, M.A., Head Master of Merchant Taylors' School, Crosby; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
 Bernard, Rev. Edward Russell, Vicar of Selborne; Canon of Salisbury Cathedral.
 Bouchier, Rev. William C., Chaplain to the *Warspite*.
 Brabazon, Rev. John, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Rodney*.

Caiger, Rev. William Stephen, Rector of St. Mark's, City Road, Manchester.
 Dandridge, Rev. C. E., M.A., Chaplain of All Saints' Convent Home, Eastbourne; Vicar of Linslade, Bucks.
 Davies, Rev. Timothy, Vicar of Gartheli, Cardiganshire; Vicar of Bettws Leiki, Cardiganshire, by dispensation.
 Diggle, Rev. John William, M.A., Vicar of Mossley Hill; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
 Dupuis, Rev. Charles Seymour, M.A., Rector of Crowcombe, Somerset.
 Eyre, Rev. Canon John Rathdall, M.A., Vicar of St. Helen's; Rural Dean of Prescot.
 Fowler, Rev. Montague, Domestic Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury; Vicar of St. Lawrence, Thanet.
 Hanson, Rev. John Clarke, I.L.M., Vicar of Thornton-with-Allerthorpe-and-Melbourn, Yorkshire.
 Harcourt, Rev. Gerald, Senior Curate of the Parish Church, Chatham; Vicar of All Saints', Battersea Park.
 Hardy, Rev. E. A., M.A., Chaplain, Malta; Archdeacon of Malta.
 Harvey, Rev. George Tyson, M.A., Prebendary of Ketton, in Lincoln Cathedral.
 Honeyburne, Rev. James Hardy, M.A., Vicar of St. Philemon's, Toxteth Park; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.
 Karney, Rev. G. S., M.A., Vicar of Melton Mowbray; Surrogate for the Diocese of Peterborough.
 Leigh, Rev. James Gerard, M.A., Rector of Walton-on-the-Hill; Rural Dean of Walton and Everton.
 Jewell, Rev. Gordon J. H., Chaplain St. George's-in-the-East Union Infirmary and Schools; General License for the Diocese of St. Albans.
 Lloyd, Rev. Daniel, M.A., Vicar of Llandrygarn-cum-Bodwrog; Rural Dean of Llifton, Anglesey.
 Marsden, Rev. M. H., Rector of Poulton-le-Sands, Lancashire; Vicar of Spalding.
 Petit, Rev. Paul, Minor Canon of Lichfield Cathedral and Lecturer at the Lichfield Theological College; Warden of the New Training College for Lay Workers in the East of London.
 Pierpoint, Rev. Richard Deare, M.A., Rector of West Halton, Lincolnshire.
 Smartt, Rev. W. H., Rector of St. Paul's, Heaton Moor; Honorary Chaplain to Mauldeth Hospital.
 Smith, Rev. Irton, Curate of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Vicar of St. George's, Chorley.
 Stanton, Rev. V. H., Canon of Ely Cathedral.
 Stewart, Rev. C. H. Hylton, Precentor of Chester Cathedral; Rector of West Kirby.
 Symonds, Rev. Benjamin Legge, M.A., Rector of Haversham, Bucks.
 Taylor, Rev. William Francis, D.D., Vicar of St. Chrysostom, Everton; Archdeacon of Warrington.
 Tebbutt, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Doncaster; Rural Dean of the Doncaster District.
 Thompson, Rev. J. D., Incumbent of St. Leonard's, Bootle.
 Vaux, Rev. G. B., Vicar of Christ Church, Wolverhampton; Vicar of St. Mary's, Chatham.
 West, Rev. John Oliver, B.A., Chaplain of St. John's, Deritend.
 Willoughby, Rev. Nesbit Edward, Vicar of Immingham, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. Stephen, D.D., at Shoultham Hall, on the 3rd inst., aged 76.
 Atkinson, Rev. Miles, M.A., for thirty-three years Vicar of Harewood, at Cumberland Villa, Headingley, on the 6th inst., aged 78.
 Boscawen, Hon. and Rev. John Townshend, at 34, Brook Street, London, on the 7th inst.
 Butler, Rev. Edmond Thomas, at Trotton Rectory, Petersfield, suddenly, on the 2nd inst., aged 58.
 Deane, Rev. Charles, D.C.L., Vicar of St. Faith's, Maidstone, at the Vicarage, on the 1st inst., aged 64.
 Onley-Prattenton, Rev. George Deakin, M.A., at Tunnell Hill, Worcester, on the 2nd inst., aged 61.
 Ralph, Rev. J. L., Rector of Aghancon, Ireland, on the 4th inst., aged 39.
 Tayler, Rev. E. H., formerly Curate of Wallasey, at Auckland, New Zealand, on May 21, aged 28.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PETER AND CORNELIUS.

BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY ON
SUNDAY EVENING, JUNE 30TH, 1889.

"Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee these words, whereby thou and all thy house shalt be saved."—ACTS xi. 14.

THIS story of St. Peter is described at length in the wonderful chapter that has been read to us for the Lesson this evening—the chapter that tells how the old Roman sought for God in darkness, and how Peter helped him to find God; and we may think how this repeats itself in Christian society for ever. The first duty of every Christian is to make others Christian, and the first duty of every man is to seek after God. The moral of this story is put in our Lord's own words: "Seek, and ye shall find." And the promise as regards the things of this life, what is it? Why, just put in the word that gives it its whole significance: "Seek and ye shall find God." One of the members of the Chapter of this glorious house has given us a beautiful work upon "Seekers after God," telling the tale of how many a soul has turned to God in darkness and has found Him, only in a certain measure perhaps, yet found Him certainly. This is the story of Cornelius, the Roman seeker, who sought God under great difficulties, and was wonderfully blessed to find Him to perfection. Think what Cornelius was for a moment, and how he was placed; think of the abundance of his difficulties. He was an officer over a hundred men in the Roman army, commanding in a garrison town, and a strange garrison town, where every other man you met was a man of some strange race. Cornelius was a man with a large household, cumbered with much serving, a man of a great family, or belonging in some way to one of the oldest families of Rome; with a large household about him, with soldiers and servants. Besides that, like the centurion of Capernaum, he was a well-known man—one who was had in honour among the nations of the Jews. You realise the difficulties of an officer in these days; but think of Cornelius in such a place, among such people, his soldiers unrestrained by the bonds of Christianity. If there was any man cumbered with much serving, it was Cornelius the centurion. And now St. Luke does not call him a proselyte. If he were a proselyte, if he had been so far advanced as to have enrolled himself amongst the worshippers of the

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 703.

Temple he would have been a proselyte, but here he is called a "devout man," a word which is used again and again to describe those who were attracted to Israel and Israel's God. So we find this man whom we should have thought most likely to be a pagan of pagans, asserting a right to be religious; asserting a right to have a religious household; asserting a right to have servants to whom he could tell the wonderful things that God was working for his soul, and having devout soldiers among those who waited upon him continually. Here was a man who dared to pray openly in his household at the hour of prayer, at the hour when the smoke of the sacrifice was rising in the Temple Courts of Jerusalem many miles away; a man who kept one of the weekly fasts, going to his prayers, and all men knowing it. He puts us in mind of the Christian hero who hung a white handkerchief out of his window when he was at prayer, so as to show that he was not to be disturbed, and no man, native or soldier, dare speak to him while the handkerchief was there. Cornelius was a yearner; he was yearning for the truth, and possessing so little of it. And many an Englishman in his position is like Cornelius—he is troubled with business from morning till night, surrounded with unsympathetic people—not over well instructed in the truth, but daring to be boldly religious in all his life. Before we go on let us bethink ourselves what a teaching there is about this Cornelius. We hear of many a man, a perfect heathen, who prays, who does penances, who gives alms, a God-seeking man, and there are some of us who say, Need we try to make these men Christians? You might as well say, Need we deliver them who all their lives long are in bondage, in fear of death? Look below the surface, look at some great Chinese Confucian philosopher, penetrated with all wisdom, and see his door hung over with amulets to keep the ghosts out of his house. Go to some Confucian temple, and see the noble sentences of old philosophy written in texts upon the walls, and look a little and see the declaration of some Confucian priests, that all prayers in this place are sure to be answered if they are offered up to the venerable Fairy Fox. Take the men themselves. A missionary tells us that he knows twenty or thirty Brahmin societies for studying Scripture. A priest among the monasteries tells us how he received twenty questions to be answered according to Christian teaching; twenty questions not from individuals, but from bodies of men seeking the truth. Let us be sure that He that blessed Cornelius is blessing these men; He will not leave them in the dark, at least if we have anything of the spirit of those apostles to whom we trace.

Now a word about him who answered the question—Cornelius the seeker, Peter the answerer. Peter—the very text reminds us that he had not always been Peter, that he had had a Jewish name of his own, and the name of The Rock had been

given him by the Lord. We know something of his aims: we know that with a change of name there had come also some change of his views, and we find him in this very chapter lodging in the house of a tanner. The tanner had an unclean occupation, and the slightest touch meant defilement; and that is the direction in which Peter's mind was moving. In the account read to us this evening we see how God made use of these thoughts of his, and we must bethink ourselves how God always makes use of men's thoughts to lead them on. Upon our own thoughts there come touches, words, breaths from the Holy Spirit, very delicate, very easily silenced by anything like roughness from our own souls, by insincerity, by pretending to listen and not listening really. Life to most of us lies in very small things. There are very few of us indeed to whom life lies in great actions, and never do we come to great actions unless the small actions are well managed. This life for most of us is a life of small actions, small words, small thoughts; but the thoughts are ourselves, the thoughts are the inner actions, and we may consider what a contrast there is in many men between the inner thought and the outer life, the inner temper, the inner spirit, the inner love and the outer life of respectability lived under restraint, not daring to break out. We must think how the angels, or the spirits who watch us, will not consider things of the outward life to be really life; it is the life that is lived in our own souls, in the spirit, whatever and wherever it may be; it is the life of thought which the spirit and the angels and God Himself observe and count for life. Yes, the life in the thoughts is the only life. How awful is that story where our Lord, speaking of one of the deadliest sins, says "it is committed already in the heart." This body of ours is but the instrument of that spirit, and when it is broken it affects not the life of the spirit in the least. When the body dies it is but the breaking up of a telescope or an eye-glass, so that a man sees no more in this present world, but is none the less the same man. Peter had the genuine life in his thoughts, his whole soul was set to understand what was the teaching of his Master, and how he should fulfil it. He is hungry and fasting, and fasting brought thoughts of food and restrictions placed upon it, and such thoughts as these were passing through his mind. "Can these things be part of my faith now? Has Christ left me under these restrictions, and are they always to be?" And, then, as he was on the housetop there was the Mediterranean in sight, there was the thought of Jonah bound up in the thought of Joppa; Jonah the prophet of old sent out to preach to the nations, and warn them that they might not perish; and with these thoughts there came upon him the ecstasy of the vision. God's teachings are always to the point, always using the thoughts we have, or can have, always just leading on a step further. And the vision

passed, and Peter is left in great perplexity. As it passed away to heaven again he was much perplexed as to what the vision might be, and as he thought thereupon he questioned thus to himself: "The vision of the clean and the unclean is this: to teach me that my own general restrictions, my own technicalities, my own formalities are breaking away." Why, it would be great if it had been only that; but it is much more than that. Ah! there is many a time, many a day, when we are touched with inquiries as to the meaning of things; from time to time there come upon us visions of a holier and a purer state of mind, and as the vision passes we remain in perplexity. The answer did not come to Peter all at once. Peter never found out that there was a meaning infinitely beyond all that he had thought until he came to the meeting of Cornelius and his friends. Then, in Peter's own words, he got the meaning of it: "Of a truth I perceive," said he, "that God is no respecter of persons." The great teaching of the vision never opened upon him until that meaning came. Then the old text flashed upon him, "Neither doth He respect any person"—one of those beautiful passages like diamonds embedded in the rock, which God had said to Israel so many times, and yet it had no deep meaning for Peter until that moment came. That little saying is the law of God's nature. Let us notice how Peter is the same genuine man we have in the Gospel—how the very same character comes out in Peter here in the Acts of the Apostles as in the Gospel. Let us try to realise here all these thoughts of Peter about this awful vision, the order to violate everything which he thought sacred up to that moment. "And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter, kill and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord, for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." Is not that Peter all over? Is there another man who would have spoken so? Is not that exactly like what you have in St. Matthew, when Our Lord, after the Transfiguration, took His apostles and began to reveal to them that the Son of Man shall suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes and be killed and be raised again the third day? And Peter when he was listening to the Master says: "Not so, Lord. Be it far from Thee, Lord; this shall not be unto Thee." You have this bold, strong man always bursting out with the first thoughts of his heart. When he was overpowered by his draught of fishes, when he was bidden to cast out the net, what did Peter do? He is always so natural. The contrast between his life and what must be the nature of the Person who had done this for him is so great, that his one prayer is, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man, O Lord!" So now, in a lesser way, how characteristic are the words and actions of this same natural man. He goes down from the top of the house, and finds a soldier and a servant. He only knows that they want him, and so he is ready

to go. "Behold, I am he whom ye seek"; he is he is ready, always so prompt with his great energy and great strength. It was his promptitude that burst out and made him deny his Master, and when his Master asked him if he loved Him, scarcely could he answer, but only said: "Thou knowest that I love Thee."

Cornelius the seeker—Peter the answerer. Do not you think there was a third person in this great affair? Do not you think that that voice was recognised crying "Peter, kill and eat?" "Not so, Lord." Surely Peter knew he was speaking to the same person; he knew by the tone or the style. It was like the style of our Lord; that wonderful style of Christ—very brief, perpetually giving riddles and declining to give any answers; stating things that seem to contradict one another, and leaving it to us to find it out. It was so like our Master to say: "Rise, Peter, kill and eat." It was just in the same way as when the five thousand were gathered on the hill with no food and far from the villages, our Lord said, "Give them to eat." He Himself knew what He would do.

In the same way when He said to His disciples, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Saducees," and they were so confused and thought it was because they had no bread. Or again, when the Jews asked Him for a sign, He said unto them, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee: Follow thou me." These words of Christ are all so full of meaning to be gradually worked and thought out. The very text of Scripture seems to be very clear: it speaks of the voice, and then a little while after there is no more sound of the voice from heaven, and it is a spirit within that speaks to him and says, "Behold three men seek thee. Arise, therefore, and get thee down and go with them, doubting nothing, for I have sent them."

What is the moral of this? It is the simplest and plainest moral, the wisdom of a child, which we are so old before we learn. The first lesson drawn from Peter and from Cornelius is to act upon our convictions. They acted upon their convictions. Although they were such different convictions, they both led to the same end, and the result was the meeting of the two great clouds, the meeting of the Jewish and the Gentile world. Cornelius's venture of faith must strike everyone: the taking his chance of ridicule, telling two servants and a soldier "I have seen an angel," and sending them upon a chase to the end of Palestine to find a man in consequence, making quite sure of his comings and inviting friend to meet him. All this is done before there is any token of Peter's arrival; he is quite sure God called, the angel spoke, and the soldier has nothing to do but to obey. He was waiting for light, and he was sure that God meant to give him light. Dear friends, people are waiting for light everywhere. Remember how Christ said

to Paul, "I have much people in this city," the moment Paul arrived at Corinth. And, the whole world over there are people waiting for us, and in your own homes, in the next house to yours, in your office, in your workshops, there are people waiting for light; waiting for you. How easy it would have been for the angel to give Cornelius some instructions; but no, he was sent to Peter. Christ must be made known from man to man. And you have those delicate convictions that Peter had; you have thought of your own, you you have the movings and pulsings to care that people round about you shall be Christian indeed, and you will follow them. They do not wait for angels, they wait for you; they do not wait for visions, they wait for kindly human words; and the Christian who is not a propagandist is not a Christian at all. Some will say: "I am not clear myself; I am not like Peter; I have my own doubts; I have my own difficulties." Was Peter clear? Peter never knew what the vision meant until he actually found himself among the people he had to speak to. Some say: "I am sure no one waits for me; no one can expect it of me." My dear friend, you do not see that every Christian is like both Peter and Cornelius; he is like the man who is waiting for more light, and he is like the man who gives light to his neighbour. Peter had his difficulties as well as Cornelius, and perhaps Peter's difficulties were more serious, and more subtle, and more woven into his life, and the answer to them was only suddenly grasped when he actually found himself before those he had to speak to. Then it was that an obscure passage of Scripture flashed into his mind. So it will be with you. It was in the midst of work that Peter came, dusty and hot, and the flash came upon him that God is no respecter of persons. He had never seen it before. Your own life may not be perfect, no one's is perfect, no man has a perfect life in this world; the fact that your life is not perfect is your human condition, and it is not to hinder your showing what light you have. Because you have not an electric light upon the mountain, there is no reason why you should not put a little candle into your window to guide the traveller through the dark.

How seldom in this world does sunlight shine without a cloud, but then how strangely the clouds clear, and in what different ways. Sometimes our cloud of doubt is broken by a great sorrow, one terrible loss, one death will clear a man's doubts away and throw him at the feet of Christ. Sometimes a cloud is broken away by sunshine—that is when God sees that brightness and happiness are good for us, and then, if the heart is at all tender, how the clouds break and disperse. Sometimes the cloud is swept away with a crash—that is when God sees that not brightness but a judgment is good for us. Sometimes the clouds distil like soft rain on the dry ground and on the thirsty woods

—that is when our tenderness is brought out by our having compassion upon them that are out of the way; compassion upon them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death; for though we have little light yet we have compassion, and from the little rent in our cloud the light streams through, and we see by trying to teach others what the truth of God is. What, then, is to be the course of every one of us. A simple character with reverence and anxious activity. Reverence, not mocking; mocking will spoil all. Anxious activity, not idleness; idleness will prevent acceptance with God. You want the two together. Some people are reverent, yet they exert themselves not for others. There are all sorts of convictions, but that is the simple, noble character that God accepts. Then the second point is to pray according to our light. See how often Cornelius was praying. The Old Testament frequently emphasises this. You remember in Isaiah, "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of His servant, that walketh in darkness and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God." There is no complication there, just to know He is present, and trust Him. Surely there is promise of light here. And then, one more point. Go like Peter where you are sent. What does that mean? Do acts which you know to be obedient to God and not to self. Determine to do those things, fearing God and working righteousness, being just and being reverent, praying just according to your light for strength, and then doing acts which you know to be obedient to God and not to self. If you so do you need have no fear but you will die with light. One day or another a light will break in upon a thought of your own or upon a Word of God. I cannot tell you what that light is, it is some communicaiton of God Himself to the soul; I know not because I know not the nature of my own spirit, and how can I know the nature of God's spirit? It is like one of those days when perhaps you stood upon the sea-shore, so dark you cannot see the horizon, and below at your feet there were just dashing a few angry white waves. Then far off in the very mid distance one little rift opens in a cloud, and through it darts a ray of the sun that makes the horizon purple like the gate of heaven. So it is with us, if we walk in our darkness and have no light, and will only hold fast to do anything we know to be obedient, not to seek self, to pray according to our own light, to be anxiously active where we see the opening, and to be reverent, God will dart that ray upon us, which will give us light and lead us on to glory.

—♦—

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE LATE CANON COOK.

BY THE REV. HENRY WACE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON, PREACHER AT LINCOLN'S INN.

SERMON PREACHED AT LINCOLN'S INN CHAPEL, ON SUNDAY, JUNE 30TH, 1889.

"The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy."—JAMES iii. 17.

MY brethren, I venture to think it may occur to some of you that this inspired description of the wisdom that is from above is fitly recalled to our minds by the gracious memory of one who has just been added to the long list of those for whom, Sunday after Sunday in this chapel, we thank God as having departed this life in His faith and fear. Those members of this congregation who remember your late preacher, Canon Cook, over whom the last prayers were said on Wednesday in Exeter Cathedral, will thank God for having known a character which so eminently corresponded to the description we have been considering, and who did so much, by word and by example, to impress that disposition on all who came within his influence, and especially upon ourselves. That quiet simplicity, that absence of all ostentation, on which the gracious Archbishop dwells, prevented his being as widely known, or his influence perhaps as widely felt, as his friends might have wished or expected. But within the sphere on which, from time to time, he concentrated, with entire disinterestedness, the energies of his heart and soul, he promoted in the most eminent degree the influences of that wisdom of which the text speaks. At a moment when his memory is thus recalled to us, it seems alike a duty and a privilege to recollect the gracious characteristics which so specially marked him in this respect. His career was one which, as is constantly the case under the providential government of God, seems to have been peculiarly adapted, when faithfully used, to foster the wisdom which he exhibited in such fulness in after life. Born eighty-five years ago, he took a distinguished classical degree at Cambridge in 1828. He then went abroad for some years and studied at Bonn, where he attended the lectures of two of the most famous German scholars of this century—Niebuhr and Schlegel. He became thus familiarised, at the outset of his career, with that movement of German criticism and speculation which has since held so large a place in the intellectual and religious life of our day. Instead of its coming upon him as something new, as it has to a large extent come upon the English mind, so that the flow of some tide of German speculation may be felt in this country at the very moment when it is on the ebb in Germany itself, he was acquainted with every

turn of modern German thought and criticism from its first rise ; and he had met and considered the problems it raises long before its influence was felt among us. I know not how far it may have been due partly to this experience, or partly to a severe illness by which he was for some time crippled, that he was not ordained for eleven years after he took his degree, and for a part of that time he lived in France taking private pupils. Though he was reserved respecting his personal experiences, he spoke to me more than once of great struggles through which he had passed, and his sermons bear frequent evidence of his keen apprehension of the fact that the religious difficulties of his own and of other days arise out of problems of profound gravity and anxiety, on which the deepest and most vital forces of thought and feeling are engaged. There is every sign that he firmly and patiently faced those problems before he took his stand finally on the Christian revelation as the ultimate solution of all such perplexities. Those years, moreover, of waiting afforded him an opportunity of laying the foundation of the immense learning he steadily accumulated ; and his capacity for continuous, thorough, and tenacious study was wonderful. At length, in 1839, he took holy orders, and was appointed to a curacy in Gray's-inn-road. But his capacities were soon discovered by the Bishop of London of that day ; and, considering the knowledge he must by this time have acquired of the various methods of education, he was appropriately called upon to be one of the first inspectors of elementary education in this country. That office he discharged for some twenty-five years. It was a very different office then from what it is now. Elementary education had almost to be created ; inspectors were few ; and he travelled over all England, from Durham to Truro, in the discharge of his duties. The intercourse he thus obtained with men of various characters and needs, and with various classes of society, must have assisted him in acquiring that general sympathy with other minds which he afterwards displayed. But during all this busy time he was also studying early and late, laying up the stores to be used in his future work. By that capacity for continuous study of which I have spoken, he contrived to acquire during this active life a most rare, and I believe I may say, an extraordinary acquaintance with the wide field of Christian literature and history, and with numerous languages. In particular, the entire series of Christian Fathers and the details of early Christian history were specially familiar to him ; and he seemed to apprehend the whole range of Christian thought and Christian life with a peculiar comprehensiveness.

His favourite study, I believe, had been Hebrew, and had his own wishes been fulfilled, he would have chosen to devote himself to the promotion of that study in his own University. But these various

experiences and opportunities were really preparing him for another work for which he was selected in 1864. He was then asked to undertake the editorship of the *Speaker's Commentary*, and thus to furnish the English Church with a commentary on the Holy Scriptures which should fairly exhibit the results of modern as well as of older scholarship ; while at the same time his appointment to a canonry at Exeter afforded him the necessary leisure and means for so arduous an undertaking. The circumstances already mentioned in his previous career show how eminently he was fitted for this work. In an undertaking of such extent it was inevitable that there should be some inequalities. But it may be safely said of it that it combines in a higher degree than any other work of similar extent, whether here or abroad, the results of the best learning, old and new. He had seen too much of the various schools and schemes of criticism to be carried away by any one of them. He thought that most of such schools had contributed something to the better elucidation of the sacred volume ; but it was his settled conviction that the truth itself was larger and more stable than all, and that, however details of interpretation might vary or be improved, the great central truths and facts of the Jewish and Christian Revelation, as understood by the Fathers and chief teachers of the Christian Church, ever came out more clearly from discussion. His mind, in dealing with such subjects, was conspicuously marked by that 'purity' of which the text speaks. He was influenced by no bias for a particular school, still less for any personal feeling or interest. Every question was considered and discussed by him in a spirit 'peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated.' There was no 'partiality' and no ostentation in his treatment of any subject, and he ever wrote in the purest spirit of one who sought only for truth. Since the time when his powers were active, discoveries have been made in some branches of Biblical knowledge which may require the modification in points of detail of some of the conclusions in which he acquiesced. But his own contributions to that Commentary will ever remain treasures of criticism and exposition, and, as might be expected from his opportunities, they afford in many respects the best review which can be found in this country of the course of German criticism up to the date when they were written. Nor was this the only service, nor in some respects the most important service, which he rendered to the Sacred Volume. When great authorities were exerting their influence to introduce changes in the text and in the interpretation of important passages of the New Testament, his wonderful learning was at once ready to recall considerations and facts which were in grave danger of being neglected. This is not the place or the time to express an opinion as to the ultimate result of such controversies as he was engaged in respecting the Revised Version or the translation of the

Lord's Prayer. But it will probably be admitted, even by those who differed from him, that he rendered a most conspicuous service in preventing decisions being arrived at without more mature consideration of the weighty facts and arguments to which he called attention.

"But all these qualities, of pure truth-seeking, peaceableness, and gentleness, found, as many will think, their most appropriate field in his office as preacher to this society. Here, for many years, he bestowed upon us the ripe fruits of his long life of meditation, thought, learning, and experience, in the very spirit of the text. Those who were privileged to listen to his sermons here will remember how they were sensible of being brought into contact with a mind full of all knowledge and wisdom, human and divine, moving easily, and without apparent effort, alike in the region of the highest spiritual verities and in the struggles of ordinary moral experience; in sympathy with every stage of life, young or old; dealing at once tenderly and firmly with difficulties and doubts, and guiding our hearts and minds steadily in the way that leads to everlasting life. He always imparted the impression of that large conception of Christian life and thought which is characteristic of the early Christian Fathers. Peaceably and without controversy, gently and with easy entreaty, he conveyed to us his own deep conviction that the Gospel reveals the ultimate home of the human spirit, its only hope of salvation from its temptations, distresses, and evils, and its only perfect guide to mercy and good fruits. It was not only, nor so much, that he touched every subject with the steady and comprehensive hand of a master, but that he dealt with moral and spiritual problems with the firm and sure grasp of one whose spiritual experience had encountered them all, and who had found his own rest with the Lord whom he loved and served. 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,' is the utterance which his preaching was eminently calculated to enforce. He has now gone to that rest; but he has left a large earnest of it to those who listened to him here, and it will not be his fault if any of us fall short of it. The anthem you have just heard, 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee,' might well have been his motto; and in the closing years of his life, amidst much suffering, he exhibited an eminent example of that abiding peace. May it be given to us all to follow him, and to live and die in the spirit of that heavenly wisdom, of which he was so gracious an instrument."

It is stated that the Dean of Norwich (Dr. Lefroy) proposes leaving Liverpool on Monday for Riffel Alp, Zermatt, where he has built a small church, in which he will conduct the services during the month of August.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C.B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary; **OBESITY IS CURED**, and will be **gratis and post free**, on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 20, 1889.

CHURCHMEN.

IN the Church of England as established by law much is implied, among other things, the enjoyment of constitutional privileges and the enforcement of contract rights. The extent to which both of these are violated may best be gauged by taking a case parallel in principle. Let it be supposed the master of a workhouse, receiving food from the guardians bought out of the rates for the use of the pauper inmates, and then depriving them of their fair share, that he may fatten a sty of hogs to sell, or keep a flock of geese for show. Suppose the Board of Guardians of the poor won't know, or, knowing, won't act to put a stop to this monstrous breach of contract and violation of rights; can aught be done to abate this scandalous misuse of the taxes of the ratepayers? The first thing to be done in such a case is to apply to the Superior Courts for a *mandamus*, to compel the guardians to inquire into and correct this iniquity. Who would blame the men who came forward in such a case, braving censure, to encounter "masterly inactivity" in its strongholds of contemptuous indifference and guilty connivance? Now, if we read parish minister for master of workhouse, parishioners for paupers, tithe-payers for tax-payers, bishops for guardians of the poor, and the Church Association for the humane prosecutors of those pastors who "give a stone for bread" to their parishioners, or of those bishops also who either do the same or else look on and do nothing, we arrive at the *rationale* of the present situation. Such a work has been necessary, nay, rather this is now become still more necessary than it was ever before. As long as this state of anomalous ecclesiastical activity and

inactivity in combination exists, a constitutional right and a contract obligation also exist. And somebody must come forward to see these set right, or else the fundamental principles of the constitution and of contract are set at naught, and the intolerable anomaly of tithes paid to support one religion being used to advance another and an antagonistic religion—one, too, that will continue—that proved a national curse in exasperating exhibition. But then another question arises—has the Church Association so effectually met the first difficulties that no other body is needed to aid in the great work of fully delivering the poor and needy, the ignorant and indifferent, from this curious form of clerical invasion and episcopal *dolcè far niente* in combination? The subject deserves impartial consideration in the spirit of brotherly love. If the new body were to supersede or “shunt” the old and most successful body, after it had braved so long and done so much, there could not be a second thought about the impolicy of such a movement. But is there any need of this? or any good ground—from anything in the founders themselves, or the action they have taken as yet, or the principles they have freely announced—for anyone assuming either hostile action or incompetent intrusiveness on the part of the new society? Reading their programme of principles, and knowing the antecedents of the parties moving, it is impossible to find warrant for any such presumption. Indeed, one of the chief regrets most frequently repeated by the elder society, points to a want of general support of it, and the existence of a general apathy on the subject of clerical innovations and retrograde practices in extent so great that the society could not overcome it. Surely, then, one may welcome such a further movement, rather than criticise it with hard suspiciousness; nay, more so far from doubt and regret at this step in advance, we venture to hope for other steps in advance to be taken ere long on all sides, and by all true lovers of the Reformation movement, and of constitutional rights and of public morality in contract obligations, until the disturbers of our Zion are shown up in their true colours, and their work (however well meant, or largely and fashionably patronised) becomes perfectly understood and generally avoided, as inimical to the best interests, political, social, domestic, moral, and religious of the English Church and nation. There is room, then, for the two societies, and plenty of work, too, to be taken up by them both. And so long as they do good work in this direction, they may very well “trust in God and keep their powder dry,” and each one take up an ascertained position against the formidable combination now so long at work in disturbing our Zion and poisoning the wells of salvation. For our part, we honestly wish them both God-speed, and respectfully counsel mutual consideration and the bearing of one another’s burdens

in the arduous enterprise they have bravely undertaken, we fondly trust, for the true love of God and England.

THE FUTURE OF ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

PROFESSOR SANDAY, in the *Contemporary* for this month, criticising a recent article of Mrs. Humphrey Ward’s, discusses the future of English theology. More especially he sets forth what is going on at Oxford. After describing the great progress of research in the Divinity Schools of Cambridge, Dublin, and Durham, and quoting Mrs. Ward’s depreciatory remarks on the theological faculty of Oxford, he proceeds:—

Considering that Mrs. Ward mentions more or less with honour four at least of the members of the faculty of theology at Oxford, including all who are concerned with Biblical criticism, and that she further appeals to two of these as principal witnesses in making out her own case, I think that it might have occurred to her to ask how far this very decided language could be justified. But I suspect that in truth Mrs. Ward really knows very little what the Oxford teaching is like or what is being done there. I will venture to mention one or two facts which, if she really believes in our picture, she will be surprised to hear. I call to mind at least two Nonconformists who have taken the highest class in the School of Theology. Within the last few weeks three of the principal theological prizes have fallen to Nonconformists. I have myself, as college lecturer, had a number of Nonconformist pupils of various degrees of attainment, who, I am sure, have been quite fairly judged by the examiners. For my own part I should be glad to see the restriction as to examiners to which Mrs. Ward alludes removed; but, practically, I think that it makes very little difference. Under the wise and enlightened guidance of Dr. Fairbairn, Mansfield College, the recent Nonconformist foundation, is entering into our system and is materially strengthening our hands. Once a fortnight during term a class of some dozen or more members—nearly all first-classmen or prize-winners of some kind, and a large proportion of them first-classmen not in the narrower School of Theology, but in the wider arena of *Literæ Humaniores*—meet together over a table and are engaged in collecting, verifying, and tabulating data bearing, however remotely, in the history and theology of the New Testament. In this work members of the Pusey House and of the Nonconformist College join amicably side by side. In alternate weeks another and much smaller class meets to study minutely, and at first hand, a difficult problem of textual criticism. This, of course, is rather outside and supplementary to the regular curriculum. But I need only mention the names of Dr. Driver, Dr. Cheyne, and Dr. Hatch to show that in that curriculum research is not neglected. Nor would I for a moment undervalue the genuine learning, experienced judgment, and refined theological culture which is shown by my colleagues in other departments.

I have been most reluctant to speak of some of these things; and I am sure that those who co-operate with me are of the same mind, and would much prefer silence to speech about them. We want to be doing and not talking. Nor do we desire in the very least to presume upon the value of anything we may do. Only when these sweeping charges are made, it is necessary that it should be known that those who are most directly concerned neither despair of the republic, nor intend (*Deo adjuvante*) to be wanting to it.

I am aware that Mrs. Ward will not think much of our proceedings. The prospect which she holds out to us is an “epoch of popularisation” of the results of German criticism. I reply, with full recognition of our own shortcomings, and with warm admiration of the lead which the Germans have set us, that it is unworthy of a nation with a history like ours to content itself with popularising the work of other people. We can do, and we intend to do, something more than this. We shall certainly not neglect what the Germans have done. We shall use it, I hope, with due acknowledgment and gratitude, but we shall also test it in using.

When I returned to Oxford six years ago, it was, I confess, in a less sanguine frame of mind. Like Mrs. Ward I had been absent from Oxford for some years, and I did not know what was the real state of things there. I did not know how the

scientific impulse, proceeding largely from the study of Ancient History, was allying itself with the religious temper, which is a growing factor in the life of the University. But now I see no reason why we should not have a school of genuine English theology. We have the first and great requisite—men. Mrs. Ward writes: "It grows notoriously more and more difficult to get educated men to take any interest in the services or doctrines of the Church, though they will join eagerly in its philanthropy." However this may be elsewhere, it is not the case in Oxford. But I suspect that Mrs. Ward is confounding the experience of a few years ago with the experience of to-day. My experience is, that there is the greatest willingness to work on all sides. The advantage of such a state of things is that it is possible to have a division of labour, and that recruits, as they join, can be set to the work for which by taste or attainments they are best fitted. We are thus enabled to take a wide range in our investigations. We are doing our best (though not exactly in the way that Mrs. Ward intends) to keep up an outlook over the whole field.

Special attention is being paid to the Versions. Not only are the problems of the Latin Versions being seriously grappled with, and editions on a large scale of the Vulgate and Syriac Gospels already well advanced, but we are also able to appeal to competent scholars on the more outlying Versions—the Coptic, Armenian, and Aethiopic. Now this is not important for the study of the New Testament alone, but I greatly hope that we may have placed in our hands a key to the more thorough knowledge of those pseudo-epigraphic writings for which Hilgenfeld and Dillmann have done something, but which have not yet been utilised, or are only just beginning to be utilised, to the extent to which they ought to be, in an attempt really to ascertain the conditions under which the New Testament came into being.

But I would warn our well-wishers and those who look to the Universities to supply guidance to the nation in these matters, that they must be prepared for comparatively slow advances and for a good deal of that *niedere Kritik* which Mrs. Ward regards so compassionately. For my own part I am free to confess that I have rather a partiality for the *niedere Kritik*. I deliberately chose to begin upon it myself, and I usually recommend it to those of my pupils who have a bent in that direction for several reasons. In the first place, the logical order of things is textual criticism, exegesis, higher criticism. We cannot draw safe inferences until we know the precise facts on which those inferences are to be based.* We must know first what a writer really said, and then what he really meant, before we can assign to him his place in the process of development. In the second place textual criticism is an excellent practising ground in scientific method. I believe it to be the nearest approach to pure science which theology offers. Thirdly, the student can pursue it undistracted by questions of orthodoxy or heterodoxy. While he is engaged upon it the greater generalisations are held in suspense, and opinion ripens upon them gradually and naturally without any forcing. It is not the mere adoption of conclusions ready-made by somebody else, but it grows up almost imperceptibly through the slow accumulation of facts. This is a far more healthy process. Lastly, my own belief is that the positive results of textual criticism may easily be under-estimated. The strong point about it is that the close analysis which textual criticism involves comes in where literary and direct evidence fails. I suspect that if we are to know more about that all-important century which intervenes between the Fall of Jerusalem and Irenæus, textual criticism will have a larger word to say than it has said hitherto.

But textual criticism is only one among a number of outlying subjects to which attention must be paid. We need a cloud of monographs upon debatable points of all kinds before we can approach the central problem. There is a solidarity in true science: it "moves altogether if it moves at all." Unsuspected and, so to speak, "telephonic" connections link together the most distant part of the subject. No one can tell from what quarter or from what seemingly trivial and neglected fact new light may break over a whole field. We must, therefore, observe an attitude of expectation; we must be content to wait for results from inquiries seemingly irrelevant to our main purpose. There is sure to be a certain amount of waste, and inquiries will be begun which are found to lead nowhere. In theology, as in

science, it is difficult to predict beforehand which direction will prove the most fruitful.

A process like this may well seem circuitous to the outsider. Circuitous it is, though the circles in which it moves may narrow inwardly by degrees. We have no "New Reformation" in our pockets. We do not believe in short cuts and easy solutions. We cannot fall back on comfortable formulæ like "the allegorical interpretations of Alexandria, the Rabbinical interpretations of St. Paul and the Gospels, the historical method of Josephus, the superstitions of Justin and Papias, the childish criticism and information of Irenæus." I have my suspicions as to the effect which a properly Socratic examiner might produce in *viva voce* upon a candidate who sent him in an answer like that. Such formulæ would save a great deal of laborious investigation if we could only adopt them; but they never yet "plucked out the heart of the mystery" of any period, and never will. Of all the hopeful signs that I see about me, there is none more hopeful than the spirit in which I find the younger students prepared to work. They have shown me that it is possible to be critical and yet not supercilious or self-complacent, possible to look forward to the future without breaking with the past, and possible to aim at great things, and yet to see that the way to great things lies through small ones.

I have myself lived long enough to witness the rise of the critical movement in England. It found us going on sleepily in a dull conventional groove. The leaders of the Church had been brought up in such a state of things, and it was natural that they should take alarm at the startling propositions put before them. A clamour arose; the law courts were invoked; the first promulgators of the new opinions had to fight with their backs to the wall. But this commotion was only upon the surface. The great mass of quiet-going people, the main body of Church and nation, was all the time listening and giving a patient hearing to both sides. It was not so much the ardent desire for speculative truth as the old-fashioned English determination to see fair play. The same old-fashioned English spirit prevented it from throwing itself in with either extreme. It was too staunch and loyal to its past to surrender at once to the new ideas, and yet too essentially fair-minded not to see that there was something in them. Its mind is not yet made up. It is assimilating slowly what it can assimilate. For my own part I would not have it move any faster. Thirty years in the life of a nation like ours is little enough. It would be impossible to have quicker progress which should be also sure. With the attitude of the nation, as a whole, I do not think that any fault can be found. Mrs. Ward seems to me to overcharge her picture. She sees that with which she comes into more immediate contact; and it would be strange if there were not a certain amount of impatience; but it does not sink very deep. The nation, as a whole, I feel sure, would prefer that those whose business it is to do its thinking and exploring for it should not be hurried.

Meanwhile, as our English way is, the practical solution is in advance of the intellectual. The critical movement met with another movement which was at least twenty years older than itself. That movement had gone through the same phases, the same clamour at first, the same patient observation, the same slow assimilation of what was best in it. It is less premature to sum up the results of the movement which began as Tractarianism. It has left its mark deeply imprinted on the religious life of the people. One might well think that never before had the English Church found its true vocation. It had been feeling its way towards it ever since the Reformation, but never before quite succeeded in hitting that happy mean which is so thoroughly in accordance with the genius of the race. Services devout without superstition, refined without sentimentalism, cheerful without extravagance, serious without gloom, keeping up a strict continuity with the past and expansive to meet the needs of the present: it would be, of course, too much to say that this happy mean has been attained everywhere; out of so many thousand churches there must needs be excesses on the right hand and defects on the left, which are only the kind of experiments through which advance is made; but the mean of which I speak represents the equilibrium towards which, after various inevitable oscillations, the Church of England seems gradually settling. The Church Association still exists, and may do some mischief; but the time for quarrelling is really past. This result does infinite credit to that sobriety and sound sense, that right feeling and right judgment, accompanied, it may be, by a certain slowness of wit not easily carried away by high-sounding phrases, on which we have hitherto prided ourselves, and never perhaps with more reason than at this moment. And I desire no better augury on the side of the theory than that which already lies before us on the side of practice.

* "How often have we seen a whole scaffolding of theory come down headlong when one prop, based on a faulty reading, has been perforce removed." — Mr. Joseph Jacobs in a striking article on "Recent Research in Biblical Archaeology" in the *Archæological Review* for March, 1889, p. 5.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—In reply to Mr. Murphy's letter in the PULPIT of to-day, I wish to remark that there is a great difference between the case of the Prodigal Son in our Lord's parable, and that of souls lost in hell. The former had the time and means to repent and return to his father; but the latter have lost for ever their day of grace, and consequently cannot possibly return to God. His remarks, therefore, on this matter contain the well-known fallacy of *ignoratio elenchi*; and, consequently, are nothing to the point.

Though Abraham might, with propriety, call Dives his son—perhaps from being his descendant, as the word son is very often used in this way in Scripture—yet to be a son of Abraham, and to be a son of God, are two very widely different things. Here again he commits the same fallacy.

My object in quoting Olshausen was to show that his opinion and mine agreed with regard to the "lump" in Rom. xi. 16 not being the whole human race, but rather the natural Israel. He admits now that our interpretation is right, and then proceeds to argue from the holiness of Israel to that of the human race, and writes thus: "It is not maintained that every man of the race of Israel is in himself holy," which implies that some are holy and some are not holy. Now we know that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord"; consequently, he gives up the point in dispute, and admits what we contend for, that some will be saved and some will not. But does he not perceive that to say some are not holy, and to say at the same time that the race is holy, are two contradictory propositions? It is like saying that though some sheep are not white, yet all sheep are white! The Scripture distinctly asserts that the "lump" is holy; how, then, can he maintain that some are not holy? He argues that *as* Israel was holy, *so* is the human race; that is to say, according to his own interpretation, that "it is not maintained that every man of the race is holy." And is not this the very thing that I contended for in a former letter, when I said that it was a "flagrantly absurd idea" to say that the whole human race was holy? I hope he will pardon my apparent unkindness in the use of strong terms; but to make his case good he ought to prove that the race of mankind stand to the elect Church in the same relation as Israel did to the first-fruits. This is more than he will be able to do, so he need not attempt it.

Further on we meet with this astounding sentiment, that "if it were in all times and places true that Noah, Daniel, and Job could only save themselves, a Church would never have been formed."

Now this implies two things: first, that Noah, Daniel, and Job could save themselves! Secondly, that they could save more than themselves! With regard to the first, Scripture informs me that "salvation is of the Lord"; and, in respect to the second, that "none can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him" (Psalm xlix. 7). Thus Mr. Murphy's foundation vanishes, and his superstructure falls to pieces. He is fond of reiterating his belief of what he thinks is true, but we have nothing to do with his beliefs. His believing a thing is no

reason why another person should believe it. The latter part of his letter, which amounts to this, that because all men are immortal all men will be saved, requires a better proof than he is able to give. His assertion is 'the only proof that he offers; but we would like something more than that.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, 15th July, 1889.

SIR,—I am painfully impressed by the atmosphere of extreme gloom which pervades the conceptions brought forward by Mr. Donaldson in his letters to the PULPIT. If what he asserts is a correct interpretation of the statements on divine authority concerning the destinies of the intelligent creation, I do not see how any being gifted with intelligence and kindly sympathies could wish to pass an immortal existence, even in the condition which those holding his opinions call Heaven. Is there a civilised man in our days who would be willing to live in a country on earth where no anxiety or desire was shown by those who professed to be wise and virtuous, to relieve sorrow and misery, and to diffuse the principles and emotions of light and love?

How is it that those who belong to Mr. Donaldson's school of thought appear to take so little account of the moral consciousness? They lacerate the tenderest sensibilities of human nature with the air of men who are propounding the most salutary truths. I have often thought that although Byron and Shelley have been strongly censured for bitter and irreverent language, the greater culprits were those whose fearful misconceptions of Scripture have disorganised human minds and hearts.

Mr. Gladstone, who is a competent judge on such points, told us more than a year ago that there is a general aversion to dogma, even among "good and devoted men." That, I take it, is owing to the mists of sophistry and darkness which the Augustinian theology diffused throughout the regions of religious thought. It was not so before his time, as it has been clearly shown that some of the most eminent early writers in the Christian Church believed in the universal Fatherhood of God, and the complete resources provided in the Scheme of Redemption to secure the welfare of all. Some of them also taught that God is a consuming fire, to destroy sin, not the sinner, who might have to pass through most painful and protracted discipline. I believe that if freedom of discussion had not been repressed for many centuries on the highest questions, the nations of Christendom would not have been visited by the dark ages. I think our era is somewhat indebted to those who are called sceptics, as they have assisted in procuring liberty of thought and speech, and in abating the terrorism exercised by well-meaning but narrow-minded persons.

I am truly glad Mr. Murphy has come forward once more in defence of brighter hopes and convictions, as I believe he is well able to exhibit Scriptural arguments of a right kind.

J. B.

Canonbury, 15th July, 1889.

SIR,—Mr. Donaldson, in the PULPIT of the 13th, argues at considerable length for the doctrine of a partial salvation—Christ endeavouring to save all mankind, but without success. I wish only to reply to some of the remarks at the end of his letter.

He says that where God promises to "gather together in one all things in Christ, both things in heaven and things in earth." (Eph. i. 10), nothing is said about things in hell. The reply to this is that, in the language of the New Testament, "heaven and earth" means the entire universe, invisible and visible. Compare Col. i. 16 and Heb. xii. 26, also the Nicene Creed. *Heavenly* means *spiritual*, as in Eph. vi. 12, where St. Paul, as correctly translated in the Revised Version, speaks of "the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." Heaven and hell are not opposed to each other in Scriptural language (I am now speaking only of the use of words); nor does the modern division of the universe into heaven, earth, and hell occur anywhere in Scripture; for in Phil. ii. 10 "things under the earth" refers not to Gehenna, the place of punishment, but Hades, the abode of the dead.

"If it is true that 'God is love,' it is equally true that He is a consuming fire" (Heb. xii. 29). No doubt God shows His love, not by tolerating our sins, but by "purging them away" (Ps. lxxv. 3) by fire if necessary.

"The Lord Jesus Christ shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory, whereby He is able even to subject all things unto Himself" (Phil. iii. 20). We know that Christ will yet subject all things unto Himself; and St. Paul here teaches that He will do so, not as a mere conqueror, not by mere omnipotence, but in the same way in which He will in the Resurrection (see 1 Cor. xv.) make the mortal body of our humiliation to be like the body of His glory.

"I, if I be lifted up upon the Cross will draw all men unto myself," (meritoriously by My death and instrumentally by My Gospel) (John xii. 32). This declares that doctrine of universal ultimate salvation by Christ, for which I contend.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 16th July, 1889.

THE SIGN OF JONAH THE PROPHET.

SIR,—Mr. Murphy is evidently angry with me. He does not seem to perceive that, if any one is to be at liberty to deny that words ascribed to Christ in the Gospel of St. Matthew (or any other Gospel) were actually spoken by Him, simply because he does not see their relevance, we may as well give up the Gospels altogether. This is certainly "cutting the Gordian-knot."

He says the words in question may have been inserted by some early copyist. This is to the last degree improbable, as they are found, I believe, in every MS. and version.

Such procedures I must venture to call both rash and dangerous.

C. P. M.

March 23rd, 1889.

[This letter has only just reached us; it has evidently been mislaid. We print it because it contains a most salutary warning to disputants.—ED.]

THE RESURRECTION.

SIR,—Two sermons which appeared in your paper on this subject lead me to ask a few questions. Why must we infer, from the Gospel account, a difference

in the risen Saviour's Body, from that Body that suffered? If He was unknown, for a time, to Mary in the garden, and also to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, no doubt their eyes were miraculously holden that they should not know Him. Did not His Body, walking on the water, seem to the disciples in the ship to be a spirit; and yet we know it was not so? Why state that the doors were locked, or at the moment even shut, in order to prove that His risen Body was "spiritualised," as it is called, when we know that He who could walk on water before His Resurrection could, if He willed, walk through doors, or make doors open to Him. St. Peter walked on water also, which was no doubt a miracle; that is, the water was made to support him; but we are not to suppose that his body was changed in any way for the time. When the spirit of the Lord caught away Philip was his body changed?

I do not find any foundation on which to base a suddenness or unpreparedness in the words "Jesus stood on the shore" (St. John xxi. 4). Nor do I see how such a deduction can be drawn from Romans vi. 5 as, "For he (St. Paul) tells us that we are to be planted together with Him in the likeness of His Resurrection." The Greek seems hardly to imply that no other meaning can be put on the different verbs in the verse. It seems to me that to base doctrine on a strained interpretation of a passage is more likely to weaken than confirm the truth of the doctrine. It is not in a spirit of carping criticism these remarks are made, but to elicit truth.

INQUIRENS.

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

SIR,—The Church of England with great wisdom and true critical skill has based "the three orders of ministers" on a safe and yet charitable footing in her Ordinal. And again in her Articles, she has of set purpose, so defined "of the Church," as to avoid the exclusion of the non-episcopal churches of Germany, for example. There are laid down three crucial requirements for the Church, which are moral and spiritual, rather than formal and official. Nay, even the three oldest Churches of certain apostolic origin, with that of Rome, are pronounced erring as a matter of fact, in the very item above all else important, namely, "faith." Now, not content "to let well enough alone," the Oxford School, following the modern *didache* of Newman, Pusey, and Co., must raise episcopacy and succession far higher than Scripture. History and the Church raise it. This must break down; even "a virtue in excess becomes a vice." Dr. Lightfoot's comments and researches have left such hierarchical dreamers "without a leg to stand on." This ought to suffice. But, on the other hand, writing of "Ignatius being a hero of romance," and of the Church consisting "of true and virtuous men," *exclusive* of stating the necessity of the doctrine that can alone make men such, is an error on the opposite side, namely, of incredulity, which is not only unsafe to follow, but is more likely to stimulate and exasperate the condemned misjudgment than otherwise. Believe it, sir, the *broad* will never cast out the *high*. They both agree too much in a common basis of credulity—on one side positively shown, on the other in negative operation.

P. D.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM — SHALL WE ALTER, OR ADD? DON'T!

SIR,—As the English Convocation has been preparing additions to the Catechism, will you allow one who has watched the same process in Ireland to give honest Churchmen, with you, warning of the dangers of such an attempt?

1. It is not everyone who is capable of retouching a master's work. Who is fit to improve the Apollo Belvidere, a portrait by Rubens, or a landscape by Salvator Rosa? Have not many attempts on your cathedrals, churches, or castles been failures? To improve a master's work one must have the same ideal and the same skill. How secure this in an individual? How secure it in a large body, split up into parties?

2. We tried this in Ireland. How did it succeed? The Evangelical party gave up our Lord's Incarnation, or, at least, the necessity of holding it. What did they gain by such a sacrifice of the very essential of the faith? The aid of the Broad Church party in their assault on baptismal grace! Take warning by us. Look at the miserable question and answer, thrust into the Catechism with the avowed purpose of denying bread to be a means of grace in the Eucharist! The words, indeed, are harmless; but the *animus* was heretical. I will not dwell on the language of the New Preface in reference to this question and answer. It stands as a sad warning to those who will lay their incompetent hands upon our almost sacred formularies.

3. But the dangers of an English Revision would be far greater than ours were. We had a strong body who objected to all change. Their firmness, under God's blessing, saved the orthodoxy of our Prayer-book. Every change was a disfigurement; but the vital parts escaped unhurt. How will it be with you? I see that Dr. Lee, of Lambeth Road, proposes to sweep away all the Thirty-nine Articles as a needless protest against innocent Romish peculiarities, sanctioned by Trent. On the other hand you have all those who would emasculate the baptismal services, and the doctrines of the Catechism as to both Sacraments. What will happen when the Catechism is laid on the dissecting table for these extreme parties to wrangle over? Will there be a compromise over the answer to the question, "What are the benefits of the Eucharist?" Will the Puritans succeed in striking out, "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ"—granted to them by the Ritualists on condition that the other part also comes out, "as our bodies are by the bread and wine," odious to those who deny that such powers remain when the substance of bread has vanished?

4. If compromise and surrender of the faith is impossible, what remains then but a schism and disruption? This would follow disestablishment. If it precede, it would necessarily lead to that and disendowment.

5. My advice to you is, do not touch the Catechism. As it was intended for children, it contains nothing but the essentials of the faith. It asserts only adoption and pardon in baptism. In the Eucharist it does not define the grace called our Lord's Body, whilst it only maintains against Rome that the bread remains unchanged in its substance.

6. Your proposed additions to the Catechism seem harmless, if not useful. But it is dangerous, at such a time of removing of landmarks, to touch any of our

formularies, above all the hand-book for children. Lincoln's warning against swapping of horses should be most valuable to you. It is only at a time of perfect harmony in the Church, as in 1604 and 1662, that any taking down or adding to should be attempted. So long as the Church is torn asunder, let the parties fight the matter out in the press. When they come to some agreement, it will be time enough to collect them round a table. What could they do now round a table but disagree, as they do at present before the public? When they agree on an Eirenicon, it will be time enough for them to meet and put it into words. But whether these terms come early or late, let them not touch our formularies, above all, our Catechism. The axioms of an art or science cannot be altered. One may give it up altogether; but essentials cannot be changed without its ceasing to exist altogether. Then take your stand on the Catechism; say, "he that toucheth it toucheth the apple of our eye." Take warning by us. We have in words emasculated the Catechism, and we have come before the Church with a falsehood, an intentional falsehood, in a new, useless, and most impertinent Preface.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

FORGIVENESS.

O THOU who dwellest alone in unapproachable light,
Higher than highest Heaven, and yet dost bend Thine
ear

To hear the cry of those who call to Thee out of the night
Of pain and sorrow and sin, of ignorance, doubt and
fear!

The darkness is full of fear, but the light is more awful still:—
The Light in which nothing is dark;—the Eye before
whose sight

All thoughts of the heart are open, all secrets of good and
of ill;—

O Father, help us to bear the glory of Thy might!

But if Thou seest our thoughts of sin and of sorrow, we
trust

That a Father's heart is Thine, Thy children's woes to
feel.

Thou knowest our earthly frame, Thou rememberest that
we are dust;

O send Thy spirit of power and love, to forgive and to
heal!

Save and forgive when the light of our life is overcast,
And the noise of toil and strife overpowers the adoring
hymn;

When the future looms like impassable mountains, misty and
vast,

And all that we trusted fades like an island distant and
dim.

Forgive us all, O Father! and teach us all to forgive;
That all who have done and all who have suffered wrong,
may rest

In the rest of Heaven, in the peace wherein our spirits shall
live,

In the light of God which is life, eternally blessing and
blest.

But is it true, O God, we must loathe ourselves in Heaven *
For shame of the sins we wrought on Adam's natal sod?
Did not the Saviour die, that all may be forgiven?
Has not the Christ ascended, that all may ascend to God?

* See Ezekiel xxxvi. 31.

We trust the quenchless fire of the wrath of God that burns

The chaff, when the chaff is consumed, will cease in eternal calm ;

And the breath that awakes the dead from their sleep shall breathe, and the thorns

Of the martyr's crown shall bud, and be changed to the conqueror's palm.

All that is Thine is ours. Oh, not to a hopeless Fate,
And not to a changeless Law, does our faith send up its prayer.

Where the name of God is Love, no place can be left for hate ;

Where God is the God of Hope, no room can be found for despair.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

THE Carlisle Diocesan Conference will be held in that city on Thursday and Friday next. The Wakefield Diocesan Conference is fixed for October 22nd and 23rd.

CANON TRISTRAM has been elected by the Dean and Chapter of Durham proctor to represent the Chapter in the Convocation of York, in the room of the late Canon Evans.

THE Archbishop of Cyprus visited Salisbury on Friday, the 12th inst., and was entertained by the Bishop at luncheon at the Palace. His Beatitude attended the afternoon service at the cathedral in his robes, and at its conclusion pronounced the Benediction in Greek from the Altar. Afterwards, in the vestry, he addressed a few words to the choir boys, his remarks being translated into English. Later in the afternoon the Archbishop drove to Old Sarum, and returned to London in the evening.

ON the 9th inst. a largely attended meeting of the beneficed clergy of the archdeaconry of London was held at Sion College to elect a Proctor in Convocation in the room of Prebendary Brook, who has resigned on account of ill-health. Four candidates were proposed—viz., Canon Ingram, Prebendary Shelford, the Rev. A. Povah, and the Rev. W. H. Barlow. Canon Ingram and Prebendary Shelford secured the largest number of votes, and a poll was demanded. Canon Ingram's name will be familiar to most of our readers in connection with his unwearied labours on behalf of the increase of the Episcopate, the Poor Clergy Holiday Fund, and other good works ; and we sincerely hope that he will be returned in both archdeaconries. He was proposed by the Rev. E. Hoskins and seconded by the Rev. B. Meredyth-Kitson, who dwelt upon the benefits that would accrue to the cause of Church extension by Canon Ingram's ripe experience in such a sphere as the Convocation of Canterbury. The proceedings were very harmonious, and were characterised by a refreshing absence of party spirit. On the previous Friday Canon Ingram and Mr. Barlow were nominated in the archdeaconry of Middlesex for the vacancy. If the same candidate be elected for both archdeaconries the result will, of course, be final ; but if the poll ends in the return of two different clergymen then the Bishop chooses one of the two to succeed to the proctorship.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baldwin, Rev. Hugh Charles, B.A., Vicar of Hexton, Herts.
Bentley, Rev. Robert, B.A., Rector of Pudleston.

Blackbourne, Rev. Jacob, Vicar of Keelby, Lincolnshire.
Braithwaite, Rev. E., Naval Instructor to the *Black Prince*.
Carr, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Goole ; Rural Dean of Goole.
Coombe, Rev. Walter, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Dolby, Rev. R., Chaplain to the *Black Prince*.
Faber, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Sprothorough ; Rural Dean of Doncaster.
Forrest, Rev. Robert William, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Vicar of St. Jude's, South Kensington ; Honorary Chaplain to her Majesty.
Gee, Rev. Canon Richard, D.D., Vicar of New Windsor, Reader at Windsor Castle, and Honorary Chaplain to the Queen ; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to her Majesty.
Harper, Rev. H. B., Chaplain to the *Howe*.
Harris, Rev. W. S., Chaplain to the *Inconstant*.
Hussey, Rev. Canon James M., D.D., Vicar of Christ Church, North Brixton ; Rural Dean of Kennington.
Jackson, Rev. John Russell, Rural Dean of West Elloe.
Kingston, Rev. John, formerly Rector of Cattistock ; Acting Chaplain 3rd Volunteer (Railway) Battalion, Duke of Cambridge's Own Middlesex Regiment.
Langford, Rev. Edward John, LL.B., Vicar of Brewham and Vicar of Redlynch, Somersetshire.
Lewis, Rev. R. D., Chaplain to the *Camperdown*.
Lloyd, Rev. H., late Curate of Amlwch ; Curate of Llandegfan-cum-Baumaris.
Mason, Rev. John E. S., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Australian*.
Mills, Rev. George, Rector of North and South Barrow, Somersetshire.
Moore, Rev. Augustus W. G., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist, Spalding ; Surrogate.
Morgan, Rev. C., Naval Instructor to the *Northampton*.
Morris, Rev. F. W., M.A., Head Master of Katherine Lady Berkeley's Grammar-school, Wotton-under-Edge ; General Preacher in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
Onslow, Rev. M. R. S., Chaplain to the *Undaunted*.
Payne, Rev. E. W. W., Curate of St. Luke's, Southampton ; Vicar of St. Luke's, Jersey.
Pearse, Rev. Reginald Vincent Beville, M.A. ; Vicar of Charlton, Horethorne, Somersetshire.
Pulman, Rev. William Walker, M.A., Vicar of Wellington-cum-West Buckland, Somersetshire.
Richardson, Rev. Canon William, Rector of Corwen ; Archdeacon of St. Asaph and Canon of St. Asaph Cathedral.
Routh, Rev. Cuthbert, M.A., Vicar of Hooe, Sussex.
Shuttleworth, Rev. Edward Starkie, M.A., Rector of St. Thomas's, Brampton, Derbyshire.
Sinclair, Ven. William Macdonald, M.A., Archdeacon of London, Canon of St. Paul's, and Vicar of St. Stephen's, Westminster ; Honorary Chaplain to her Majesty.
Strange, Rev. William Robert Pearson, Vicar of Stockland, Bristol.
Sturges, Rev. Herbert Court, M.A., Vicar of Bodenham, Herefordshire.
Todd, Rev. C. J. Todd, Chaplain to the *Northampton*.
Tucker, Rev. B. S., Chaplain to the *Collingwood*.
Vaughan, Rev. Ernest J., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Aurora*.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Edmonds, Rev. W. J., C.M.S., at Osaka, Japan, on the 1st inst., aged 30.
Farrer, Rev. Matthew Thomas, of Ingleborough, and formerly for many years Vicar of Addington and Shirley, Croydon, at 50, Ennismore-gardens, on the 14th inst., aged 73.
Howe, Rev. John, M.A., Hon. Canon of Worcester Cathedral, and Vicar of Knowle, at Knowle Vicarage, on the 15th inst., aged 63.
Kirkpatrick, Rev. George, formerly Rector of Craigs, at Craigs, county Antrim, Ireland, on the 8th inst., aged 91.
Rose, Rev. Richard Overend, of Winchendon, Bucks, and late Vicar of Markyate Street, Dunstable, second son of the late William Rose, Barrister-at-Law, at 46, Kenilworth-road, St. Leonards-on-Sea, on the 28th ult., aged 37.
Saulz, Rev. Vincent, at Canton Rectory, Cardiff, on the 9th inst., aged 57.
Webster, Rev. Alexander Rhind, Rector of Tinwell, on the 5th inst., aged 73.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY.

BY REV. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., ARCH-DEACON OF WESTMINSTER.

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY ON TRINITY SUNDAY.

"Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty."—REV. iv. 8.

ALL the great truths in the history of man's salvation, which we have been contemplating for many Sundays, culminate in the truth which we commemorate to-day. We have celebrated the birth of Christ, His life, His death, His resurrection, His ascension, the coming of the Holy Ghost, and all the thoughts which we have had of God the Father, the Creator, of God the Son, the Redeemer, of God the Holy Ghost, the quickening Spirit, are blended to-day in the one immeasurable thought of the triune God. Solely in our union with Him is there any hope, or any possibility of recovery for ruined and sinful man—for man, who has in all generations deserved ill at the hand of God, but to whom, nevertheless, in His infinite mercy, God offers immortality, sanctification, and redemption. Without God we are a shadow less than shade, a nothing less than nothing; we are, as an old divine says, as brittle glass in His hand. Not only could He crush us with the motion of His hand, but were He to withdraw His hand we should fall and break of ourselves. Without God, man is a thing of nought; with Him and in Him we become a little lower than the angels crowned with glory and honour.

Everything may be grasped by two handles, a right and a wrong handle; let me entreat you to take hold of the great truth which we consider to-day by the right, and not by the wrong handle, by which it has often been grasped. Think of it, I entreat you, not as an unintelligible mystery, not as a verbal dogma, not as a theological formula, but as a living faith. Think of it, not as an aggressive orthodoxy, but as a merciful revelation; think of it as an illimitable blessing, and not as an irritating creed.

That we may look at it in different lights and aspects, let us first consider it in the abstract, and ask what it teaches us about God in Himself. And here, my friends, let us not deceive ourselves. Of God in His revealed relation to us we may know everything that it concerns us and everything that it is possible for us to know; of God in Himself,

of God as He is, we know and can know nothing. How can the puny finger of man measure the arm of God? How can the finite comprehend the infinite? The moment we attempt to define God in scholastic definitions, to define God in Himself, we are lost in a chaos of contradictions. The heathen felt this also. In the Greek legend she who had desired to see the Deity in His splendour is instantly consumed to ashes. In Hindoo mythology when Brahma, the supreme, shoots down a pillar of light between the two contending deities, Siva and Vishnu, one deity wings his way upwards with the speed of lightning for a thousand years, but cannot reach the pillar's summit, and the other wings his way downward with the speed of lightning for a thousand years, yet cannot find that pillar's base. Christian theology has felt this no less clearly—that God is, in His own being, incomprehensible. In our National Gallery you may have seen a picture of the Vision of St. Augustin, who, when he was writing a treatise on the Trinity, saw a child trying to empty the ocean with a shell into a little hole in the sand. "What art thou doing?" asked the saint. "I am trying to empty the sea with this shell into this hole," answered the child. "But that is impossible," said Augustin, "Not more impossible, O Augustin," replied the child, "than for thee in thy treatise to explain the mystery of the Trinity." As regards God, our soundest knowledge is, as Richard Hooker says, to know that we know Him, and our safest eloquence concerning Him is silence, when we confess without confession that His glory is inexplicable, His greatness above our capacity and reach. "He," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "that goes about to speak of, or to understand, the Trinity by words and names of man's invention, he will talk he knows not what; but the good man that feels the power of the Father, and to whom the Son has become wisdom and righteousness, and in whose heart the love of the Spirit is spread abroad, this man, though he understand nothing of what is unintelligible, yet he alone truly understands the mystery of the Trinity. In this case experience is the best learning, and Christianity is the best institution, and the Spirit of God is the best teacher, and holiness is the best wisdom, and he that sins most is the most ignorant, and the obedient man is the truest scholar."

But observe, secondly, that when we consider God, not in Himself, not in His own blinding and unutterable perfectness, but in the way in which He has rendered Himself knowable to our finite nature, then we can know and bless and worship Him. Look, then, at the revelation of the Trinity scripturally. Can anything be more clear than that throughout Scripture God is set forth in His plurality and His unity. The Old Testament, indeed, is mainly devoted to the revelation of God the Father, but the New Testament is the special revelation of God the Son, and God the Holy

Ghost, of the *τρισάγιον*. The "Holy, holy, holy" of the seraphim in Isaiah, echoed by the "Holy, holy, holy," of the seraphim in the Apocalypse is alone sufficient to prove from Scripture the doctrine of the Trinity—"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost."

And, thirdly, if you will look at the doctrine of the Trinity theologically, remember that true theology is nothing but the formulation in precise language of the truths and experiences which we learn from revelation. Turn, then, to the first of the Thirty-nine Articles, and you will there read, "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions . . . the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And in the Athanasian Creed you will read: "The Catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the Substance." You will see at once that the language and methods of theology differ remarkably from the language and methods of Scripture. The words "Trinity," "unity," "substance," "person," "co-equal," "co-eternal," do not occur in the Bible at all. The method of Scripture is not abstract, logical, metaphysical; it is general, simple, practical. Even at the Council of Nice the pride of science was found to be far less powerful than the simplicity of faith. While the bishops were hotly disputing about subtle questions of curious theology a plain layman, maimed, and blinded of an eye in the Diocletian persecution, thrust himself through the listeners and addressed to them this wise remark: "Bishops, Christ has not left us a system of logic; He has left us a naked truth to be defended by faith and good works." And, again, when the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep of metaphysical speculation had given to the philosopher Eunomius the opportunity of enunciating many cavils and sneers and counter-arguments, there rose up the ungainly figure of a simple shepherd-bishop, who said: "In the name of Jesus Christ hear me, philosopher. There is one God who made all things by the power of His Word and by the holiness of His Spirit. This Word, whom we call the Son of God, took compassion on our wanderings and died for us. This we believe without curious inquiries. Cease, then, the vain labour of seeking proofs of that which is established by faith, and as to the manner in which these things can or cannot be. Answer me, philosopher, dost thou believe?" And the philosopher who had cavilled at the definitions of controversy was thrilled by the accents of fervent sincerity. "I believe," he said, and was baptised. Perhaps you will say, "What need, then, have we at all for these theological definitions?" You will find the plain answer to your question, if, fourthly,

you will look for a few moments at the doctrine of the Trinity historically. The use of theological and technical language in describing the great mystery of the Godhead did not spring from the Church's arbitrary choice at all, but was forced upon her by the growth of dangerous heresies. She would have remained content with the majestic simplicity of the Apostles' Creed, but at the beginning of the fourth century, insidious, heretical denials of Christ's true divinity, or of His true humanity, began to find all but universal vogue. It was on this question, the two-fold nature of Christ—God and man—that the battle of the Church's faith was fought. Divers became heretical when they endeavoured to soar up to the secrets of the Deity on the waxen wings of the understanding. Among these was the Alexandrian Presbyter Arius, who only allowed to Christ an inferior, a subordinate, a created divinity. You will say, perhaps, Was this so very fatal? I answer, yes; God is God, and we worship Christ, and it is idolatry to worship any but God alone. If Christ was not God, the Church in worshipping Him is breaking alike the first and second commandment. The heresy of Arius was confronted by Athanasius—

The royal-hearted Athanasius,
With Paul's own mantle blest.

He was then but a deacon, but it was his deep insight and his indomitable spirit, which swayed the first great Œcumenical Council in Greece, A.D. 325. Then it was that there were drawn up the additional clauses of our Nicene Creed, and the labours of that Council may be summed up in the one Greek word, *ἀλήθως*—truly. Jesus Christ was truly God. Then, in strong reaction from the heresy of Arius, rose the heresy of Apollinarius, Bishop of Laodicea, who, by an opposite range of speculation, was led to deny Christ's humanity. Again, the Church of Christ took the alarm; again, in the year 381, was summoned a General Council at Constantinople; again she condemned the heresy, and the labours of that second great Œcumenical Council may be summed up in the one Greek word *τελέως*—perfectly. The Lord Christ was not only truly God but perfectly man. Then Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, by fresh speculations, began, as it were, to disintegrate Christ into two separate and distinct persons. Again the Church took alarm. The third great Œcumenical Council was summoned at Ephesus in the year 431, and it was then set forth that, though Christ be God and man, yet is He not two, but one Christ. And the labours of that third great council may be summed up in the one Greek word, *ἀδιαίρετως*—indivisible. Christ the Lord was indivisibly God-Man. Then Eutychius, in his hatred of the heresy of Nestorius, fell into an opposite contention, and, in maintaining the one Person, seemed to deny the two Natures in Christ. Once more the Church took alarm. She sum-

moned the fourth great Œcumenical Council at Chalcedon in the year 451, and the decision of that Council may be summed up in the one Greek *ἐμφανῶς*—distinctly—Christ the Lord, who is indivisibly God-Man, is distinctly God and man. Thus we get the Nicene Creed, the holy symbol, declared at Nice, established at Constantinople, strengthened at Ephesus, sealed at Chalcedon; and thus, as Hooker again says, in four great General Councils of the Church—Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, against four great heresies—the Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian. The first aimed at the Deity of Christ, the second at His manhood, the third rending asunder His nature, the fourth confounding His person, in four great words, *ἀληθῶς, τελῶς, ἀδιαίρετως, ἐμφανῶς*—truly, perfectly, indivisibly, distinctly God and man; the Church, to save us Christians for ever from all future needless controversy, has summed up all that serves to establish the doctrine of the Trinity, by defending from heresy the incarnation of her Lord.

And yet to turn, fifthly, to an entirely different aspect of the subject, how utterly valueless would be all this orthodoxy, how utterly valueless for us to know the doctrine of the Trinity scripturally, theologically, historically, if we do not know God spiritually. A man may know all about the doctrine of the Trinity, and yet may know far less about God in reality than a pagan and a heretic; for a man knows nothing about God if he does not know that God is love. "If," said Luther, "a man would paint a picture of God, it must be a picture which is wholly love, as if divinity were nothing but a fire of love filling heaven and earth. And again, if a man would paint a picture of love it must be neither human nor angelic, but a picture of God Himself." He, then, that would be saved must thus think of the Trinity. And hence there was a childish piety in those old pictures still to be seen in the monasteries on Mount Athos, in which, by a simple contrivance, the spectator, if he stands on one side sees only the figure of the Saviour on the Cross, if he stands on the other side sees only the figure of the heavenly dove, and as he stands in front sees only the Ancient of Days, the Eternal Father; *Ubi amor; ibi trinitas*—where love is, said St. Augustin, there is the Trinity.

But, sixthly, if you know what is the meaning of the Trinity, not only scripturally, theologically, historically, but also spiritually, even then you must prove your sincerity by showing that you know it practically, that you know it experimentally. It must persuade your hearts, it must put forth its power and bring forth its fruit in your lives. And how can I better illustrate for you this aspect of the truth than by quoting the words of him who is perhaps one of our most deeply religious poets:—

At morn I prayed: "I fain would see
How three are one and one is three.
Read the dark riddle unto me."

And having thus prayed, he wanders forth into the air and sunshine; but instead of being thankful that "God maketh His sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and sendeth His rain upon the just and upon the unjust," he murmurs that God seems to treat every one alike, and the good no better than the bad. And soon after, seeing a woman in her white innocence trying to help the sinful and the fallen, he only warns her to take care lest in touching pitch she should be defiled, lest in doing this she should be herself contaminated, and should lose her horror of sin. And a little while after, passing the vile haunts of shame and misery, he hears within his soul a still small voice pleading with him for natural love and pity, but hushing the voice he speaks with contempt and anger of these, his wretched fellow-men. By this time his walk is over, and returning home to his study, he takes down his St. Augustin and his St. Thomas Aquinas and his Calvin, and tries to learn something about the Trinity from them. But in vain:—

In vain I turned with weary quest
O'er pages where—God give them rest—
The poor creedmongers dreamed and guessed;
And still I prayed, Lord, let me see
How three are one, and one is three,
Read the dark riddle unto me?
Then something whispered, Dost thou pray
For what thou hast? This very day
The Holy Three have crossed thy way,
Did not the gifts of sun and air
To good and ill alike, declare
The all-compassionate Father's care?
In the white soul that stooped to raise
The lost one from her evil ways,
Thou sawest the Christ whom angels praise.
A bodiless divinity,
The still small voice that spake to thee
Was the Holy Spirit's mystery.
How blind of faith! Oh, faith, how small!
This day thou hast denied them all.
Revealed in love and sacrifice,
The Holiest passed before thine eyes,
One and the same in three-fold guise.
The equal Father in rain and sun,
His Christ in good to evil done,
His voice in thy soul—and three are one.
I shut my grave Aquinas fast,
The monkish glass of ages past,
The schoolmen's creed aside I cast,
And my heart answered, "Lord, I see
How three are one and one is three,
Thy riddle hath been read to me."

Yes, my friends, no soul can conceive in its fulness the unity in trinity and the trinity in unity, and, least of all, is this possible to theological conceit and Pharisaic intolerance, but every soul can say, if it will, from personal blessing and from personal experience: "I believe in God the Father who made me and all the world; I believe in God the Son, who redeemed me and all mankind; I believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God." And if there be around us an ocean, as there is, of death and of darkness, an infinite ocean of light and love flows over that darkness, and in that we may see the

infinite love of God. And this is the culminating thought of the greatest poem ever written, the "Divina Comedia" of Dante. After having been made to witness the agonies of the lost, the struggles of the penitent, the glory of the forgiven, Dante finds himself at last standing before a three-fold rainbow, of which one, as light of light, reflects the other, and the third, as a breathing fire, proceeds from both, and all three rainbows are yet but one rainbow, transfused and commingled by interpenetrating light in the treble mystery of one perfect splendour. He could not soar, he says, into the meaning of the symbol, but it was flashed into his soul by one flash of intuition, and from that time forward he felt that his will was God's will; that his will

Rolled onward like a wheel, in even motion,
Like the love impelled that moves the sun in heaven,
And all the stars.

That, my friends, is the only true way to think of the Trinity. If you are ever perplexed by these high, mysterious doctrines, dismiss altogether your perplexities, and be sure that he who doth the will shall, in some form or other, savingly apprehend the doctrine.

But need I go further than the lesson conveyed by the very building in which you are gathered? Westminster Abbey, though few notice it, is throughout a great religious symbol. By the unity of this great building in its treble divisions everywhere, in breadth, aisle, and nave, and aisle; ambulatory, and choir and ambulatory; in length, nave and choir and sacarium; in height, arch and triforium and clerestory—you were meant by those holy builders to be constantly reminded of the doctrine of the blessed Trinity. And the cruciform structure of the building was meant to symbol Divinity in humanity, God in man, the death of Christ upon the Cross; and the light diffused through the whole building was meant to be a symbol of the light of the Holy Spirit. And even in smaller things the same symbolism was intended to be carried throughout the whole building. The double western door was meant to be a faint symbol of the two-fold nature of Christ; the baptistry was meant to be a symbol of the presence of the Holy Spirit; the Holy Table a symbol of the sacramental presence of Christ in His Church. Then the chapels which cluster round the shrine were meant to indicate the virgin mother, standing at the head of the cross, and the saints of the Church of God, one yet manifold. And thus this whole cathedral is meant to be for you as it were a theology in architecture—the Nicene Creed eternalised in stone and marble. While its majesties humiliate our insignificance, its mute appeal dilates and kindles our aspirations. See how the few horizontal lines seem to vanish altogether, how the upward spring of arch and roof and finial seem like one constant antiphony of *sursam corda*—lift up your hearts, and we lift them up unto the Lord.

The work of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, here, in this very building, is represented to your minds, not as an unintelligible enigma, but as a deep religious lesson, and as one unending call to worship and to love. May it ever have this deep effect upon the souls of all who worship here—Three in One and One in Three. O Thou, our Father in heaven, O Thou, our redeeming Lord, O Thou, O quickening Spirit, have mercy upon us. Make us all to know Thee whom truly to know is everlasting life.

THE QUEEN OF SHEBA AND THE SHAH.

BY THE REV. HARRY JONES, M.A., PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S AND CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO THE QUEEN.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL,
ON SUNDAY, JULY 7TH, 1889.

"Jesus said: The Queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold a greater than Solomon is here."—ST. MATT. xii. 42.

THE story of the Queen of Sheba is one of the most popularly known of those in the Old Testament. It is compact, but attractive.

We have the picture of an Eastern potentate travelling for a long distance in search of information, and being received with much splendour in one of the realms which she visited. She was accompanied by members of her Court, and a great train, which excited interest and curiosity among those who witnessed her arrival and watched her demeanour. The impression she produced was lasting, and long afterwards employed by our Lord Himself to convey one of His great lessons of truth. He had only to touch the memory of her coming in order to recall the picture of her visit to Judæa.

And this was the use He made of it. "The Queen of the South came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold a greater than Solomon is here." It is plain that her enterprise in search of knowledge met with our Lord's commendation. And He contrasted the honest laudable purpose of this Gentile or heathen potentate with such faint love of truth as marked the men around Him who had all the privileges of the then revelation.

We know little of the Queen of Sheba. The great pools of Solomon, near Jerusalem, are still surrounded by traces of the terraced gardens in which, without doubt, she and the wise king walked and talked nearly 3,000 years ago, and which would have formed the scene of one of her most brilliant receptions. How little could anyone then have thought that her journey and visit would have been made the matter of a Scriptural lesson to the un-

counted millions of long distant races throughout the world.

What was it in her that drew the favourable notice of Christ? She came, He said, from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon.

She came. She was not a woman of good intentions or wishes only. No doubt one object of her journey was to carry back and employ in the conduct of her kingdom something of what she might learn elsewhere. And for this purpose she came herself. She did not write, or dispatch ambassadors, or send to fetch Solomon's books, but came in person. A resolute woman who would see things at first hand. There is a lesson and example here to any who would learn for themselves what they wish to know.

And her coming was no simple and easy matter. She put herself to cost and trouble. She came from afar, from a place so far off that the Jews might call it the ends of the earth. Indeed, the expression is not so geographically exaggerated as it might seem, for if we look at some maps of the ancient world we find Seba or Sheba on one of its borders. It was not far from the modern stronghold now known as Aden, and thus the journey of the great company which went with the Queen would involve a long voyage down the Red Sea to Ezion Geber, the present Akabah, or to the site of the modern Suez, unless a tedious march was made through the whole length of Arabia; and in any case there was probably the crossing of the wearisome wilderness of Et Tih, the desert of the wandering, before she could reach Judæa and arrive at Solomon's Court. She had altogether at least some two thousand miles to traverse before her journey from Sheba and back again was finally accomplished. She gave herself much trouble in the pursuit of her purpose. Here is another lesson. Some people wish to learn, but will not take pains. But the royal road of the Queen of Sheba was no short cut to the knowledge she desired. All inquirers may learn of this Eastern Queen. It pleased Christ to think that she came from the uttermost parts of the earth.

And she came to hear. Not to talk, not merely to display her wealth, not to give advice; not with any petition to be presented, nor grievances to be redressed, nor with the sole purpose of seeking amusement, but to hear wisdom, to carry back something worth gaining, and not only the recollection of foreign entertainments.

Here, by the way, is another lesson, to all indeed, but especially to such as indulge in the modern desire for, and habit of, travel. There are some who journey from sheer weariness, who go to and fro upon the earth, seeking rest and finding none, or they are moved by the mere shallow spirit of curiosity, and come back with eyes that see not and ears that hear not, neither understand, the useful lessons to be learnt in other countries than

their own, and which are mostly best when gathered by personal observation.

To return to the Queen of Sheba. We need not suppose that her object was only to hear some of Solomon's proverbs from his own mouth. She did not come for literary entertainment. The power of Solomon was great. He was a great organiser, administrator, trader. He was known for his interest in architecture, irrigation, agriculture, and commerce, whereby he made his kingdom strong and famous. He was a promoter of the arts and sciences; and in all these things he showed his wisdom as well as in his sentences and writings. And the Queen of Sheba perceived this. She said (1 Kings x. 6): "It was a true report which I heard in mine own land. Howbeit, I believed not the words until I came. Thy wisdom and prosperity exceedeth the fame which I heard. Happy are these thy servants."

This perception, this readiness to learn the best that she could, made our Lord pick out the example of the Queen of Sheba from the ancient past, and hold it up as a reproach to the men of that generation. He told His people that this Queen of the South would rise up against them and condemn them because she was at great pains to learn of Solomon, while they were slow to receive lessons from one that was greater than He.

That word was true then, and it has not lost its application now. How does it concern ourselves?

It first reminds of an advance beyond that wisdom of Solomon which was heard in his words. They indeed have not passed away. The book of Proverbs forms part of the Bible. It finds a place in the list of inspired Scriptures. And more meaning is probably now seen in those ancient proverbs than was perceived at first. Many of Solomon's sentences have become household words in Christendom. Much of the wisdom of Solomon there seen indeed is now felt to have divine authority, and not to have sprung from him alone. However unwise he may have shown himself by some *acts* in the latter part of his life, divers of his *sayings* have been accepted by the devout as having come from "God."

But all this sacred knowledge was presently followed by something far deeper and wider—viz., the revelation of Christ. This was what the Queen of Sheba could not know. She yearned after such light as shown in the old world, but she could not learn about the Sun of Righteousness which had not then arisen.

It is not so with us. We retain the cream of the wisdom which Solomon was employed to convey to mankind, and, as I have said, we can see in it more than could have been seen at first. But a greater than Solomon is here. The best that was inspired of old appeared in the shape of words which were spoken, and examples set, by holy men who spoke and worked and then died.

In Christ we have a living Person and eternal

life. The divine utterances which came, whether through Solomon or David, whether through prophet or lawgiver, were and are invaluable. But God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake with the fathers by the prophets, hath in these days spoken unto us by a Son.

This opens to us something beyond all Old Testament messages, examples, and doctrine, and shows us One who is not a mere teacher, though He be come from God, but a giver of new life, who says, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of heaven."

This thought leads us further into the moral which Christ drew from the Queen of Sheba's visit to Solomon. The Old Testament mostly savours of such national prosperity as comes from migration, the conquest of new lands, the victory over enemies, and the filling of the basket and the store. Perhaps we do not sufficiently realise how faintly the light divine often shone in the midst of those darker mortal advantages. And yet we have only to open the Old Testament and read awhile in order to feel the deep meaning which again and again appears in the words of Christ when He said: "Ye have heard of them of old time," this and that. "But I say unto you" otherwise. "It is a new commandment" that I give.

Our Lord was continually filled with a sense of this change, which came with Him. "Among them," He said, "that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; nevertheless, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

In these days we sorely need to remember this. We are deeply penetrated with the flavour of material prosperity. It is often sought and spoken of as the most excellent thing. We often give ourselves as much trouble to secure it as was shown by the Queen of Sheba. And if she were a living sovereign, and were to visit us now, as another Eastern potentate has, about whose presence among us we are all now talking, we should exert ourselves to display the things on which we prided ourselves most. And they would probably be indications or proof of material prosperity. We perhaps even would neglect to show her any excellence in the shape of wise and learned words. Possibly we should confine our exhibition to the triumphs of manufacture and commerce. We should take her to see our wealth in streets, and ships, and other signs of successful art and trade. But as we look at the ancient record of her visit to Judæa there is a subtle flavour of reproach which might be detected in the final verdict she pronounced when she had seen the prosperity of Solomon, and when she parted with him (though not of his religion) could not help saying (1 Kings x. 9): "Blessed be the Lord thy God which delighted in thee to set thee on the throne of Israel."

It is possible that if she were a living potentate, and came from the utmost parts of the earth to

visit us, she might not, for anything we had shown her, be led to intimate her respect for the faith which alone makes a nation Christian as well as civilised. We might show her the great centres of civil life, and never think of asking her, any more than we have invited the Shah, to look within the doors of such a house of God as this. He may, hitherto, enter in his journal that he has seen the wealth and tasted the hospitality of England; but so far as any invitation has been given to his inquiring mind, he has been shown nothing which could even hint to him our faith in the religion we profess.

Let us take one more glance at the lesson set in our text. It plainly would lead us to perceive that there is something higher than successful commerce and industry which goes to exalt a nation. In our material procedure is there nothing which lacks the flavour of divine consecration? It is a Christian truism, and yet true, to say that national pre-eminence is neither gained nor held by trade, however honest, any more than by the sword. That indeed, just now, seems to me to be tarnished with a stain worse than that of blood, inasmuch as the news from the scene of the last desert battle in the Soudan announces a painfully conspicuous departure from an ancient Christian saying: "If thine enemy thirst, give him drink."

But it is not only in such a questionable disregard of sacred sentence that we might detect the material tendencies of to-day, and a forgetfulness of the presence of One greater than the great kings of the earth. We are apt to be opportunists and worshippers of expediency, neglecting the deep laws of life, which work slowly. We measure our place by current income and expenditure, exports and imports. We tabulate the habits of thrift which can be tested. Some, it is true, seek to lighten labour and brighten the surroundings of toil. All this is indeed well; and, in the face of much sheer and costly selfish pleasure, displayed in the gatherings, feasts, and recorded dresses of "society," has good promise. But I can imagine a golden age of savings-banks, sanitary circumstance, and shorter hours of work to the clerk, shopman, and artisan; we can picture a Utopia of improved education and popular amusement; we can think of a society which shall be industrious, considerate, and comfortable, and yet sorely lacking in the true spirit of the Christ. At any time we might take the typically excellent and wise masters, leaders, and teachers among men, and yet still say, "A greater than they is here."

Here, not standing by with local presence, but here, always, even unto the end of the world. Here, in the midst of two or three gathered in His name. Here, in the multitude of worshippers, and in the devout communicant. Here, in the chamber and the House of God, felt in the calm of the church and the business of the world. Here, and near. There needs no wearisome journey to the utter-

most part of the earth in order to find the Christ, the kingdom of God is among you; but in the going to Him, however near, there may be a greater move and change, a greater shifting of position than could be found in the longest march from one portion of the world to another. We may see many sights, have fresh views of old things. We may find a new heaven and a new earth.

But though we may quickly go to one greater than the king whom the Queen of the South came to hear, we must, like her, be ready to bear pains, perhaps in the enduring of some personal cross; we must have her mood of honest purpose and simple earnestness, or the closest nearness of the Christ Himself cannot give that special life with which He fills the soul.

THE CHRISTIAN'S OBEDIENCE TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

BY THE REV. J. W. KAYE, M.A., RECTOR OF DERRYBRUSK, ENNISKILLEN.

SERMON PREACHED IN DERRYBRUSK PARISH CHURCH, ON THE THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

"Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme: or unto governors as sent by Him for vengeance on evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that by well doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."—1 PETER ii. 13-15 (R.V.).

MAN may be truly termed the last and noblest product of terrestrial creation. In this Scripture and Science are in perfect agreement. But man is superior to other animals in his mental development and erect attitude. His marvellous faculties of intellect, language, conscience, reason, and religion, completely separate between him and the lower animals. There is in man a power of reflection, a sense of the beautiful, a capacity of generalisation, and a tendency to realise the perfection of his high destination. But man has a religious faculty—a sense of reverence and worship—which leads him to acknowledge an overruling Power and beneficent Providence. Human beings in all ages have worshipped this unseen Power, proving that man was created in the image of God, and endowed with a principle superior to that of mere animal life. In this superior principle we have our true personality, which we call *soul* or *spirit*, while our moral feelings by the exercise of reason and induction lead us to the conception and belief that there are attributes of the same kind, but infinitely higher, inherent in that glorious and Divine Being, the God of all creation. Pure religion consists in union and communion with this pure and holy God, and in love outflowing towards our fellow-men. In this we have the key to man's social

nature; for we are all children of one Father—offspring of one Creator.

Man naturally loves social intercourse, and prefers the society of his brethren rather than to dwell alone; but with society comes moral obligations. There are duties which members of society owe to each other, as well as to the whole community. These duties are necessary for peace, for progress, and for protection. But there are also important and necessary obligations which the community imposes on all its members for their mutual benefit, and for the prevention of lawlessness and crime. These are human ordinances, or ordinances of men, because they deal with human affairs, and procure human advantages. Our text sets before us—

I. *The Duty of Obedience to Civil Government.*—"Be subject to every ordinance of man." But our text limits the "every ordinance" to institutions "for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well, whether to the king as supreme, or to governors as those sent by him." As the great purpose of all civil government, recognised in holy Scripture, is the protection of the lives, liberties, and properties of all those living within its jurisdiction, obedience is incumbent upon all within its pale. The "evil-doers" are those who violate the law, while "those that do well" are those that obey the law. It is not the province of the magistrate or judge to deal with sin as sin; that is a religious question. But when sin becomes crime and violation of the civil law, then the magistrate interferes and punishes. It is the doctrine of the New Testament that civil government is not only an ordinance of man, but, in an important sense, an ordinance of God, for the Apostle says, "The powers that be are ordained of God." The very nature and constitution of man, and the circumstances in which he is placed, imply a moral obligation, both to God and to civil government. Even the so-called "laws of nature" oblige men to yield to one another such claims, liberties, and rights as are consistent with mutual justice to each other. To "despise Government," to "speak evil of dignities," are acts and deeds condemned by the written Word of God; "for God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." The basis of civil government is from God and not from man, from the earliest patriarchal ages to the present time. And because the Christian is in the world, though not of the world, he must so live and act in obedience to the laws, as that he may set a worthy example to the careless and the wicked. But as civil laws are not always perfect and consistent with the written Word of God, there may be cases in which a Christian feels he must passively suffer rather than sin against God and his conscience. If a human ordinance contradicts a divine ordinance, then a Christian must passively suffer the punishment of the law for his disobedience, and say, "We ought to obey God rather than man," (Acts v. 29.)

But St. Paul in our text is not dealing with exceptional cases; but with the general principles or rule of conduct for Christians under ordinary governments which come not by chance, but by the Providence of God.

Whether the Government be an absolute or a limited monarchy, or a national republic, "there is no power but of God," mediately or immediately. Therefore we find Christ answering Pilate and saying, "Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee of God." Our Lord did not resist the power of the civil government; nor did he call forth a legion of angels to deliver Him; but He passively suffered. "He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb so He opened not His mouth." Proceeding with our subject we have now

II. *The Motive of Obedience to Civil Government.*—"Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." Duties become easy when urged by the power of love; though before-time they may have been the most irksome and obnoxious. And St. Paul here urges obedience to civil government for the sake of Him we love. But the Roman Government was most arbitrary and tyrannical, and the early Christians refused to curse Christ and offer sacrifice to idols, and rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer for His sake. Sometimes bigotry, or fanaticism, or ignorant presumption will lead men astray, while at the same time they are filled with the mistaken idea that they are doing all for the Lord's sake. Many have thought they were carrying out God's purposes, but time and history have proved them to be lamentably wrong. St. Paul himself is a notable instance, for he says, "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts xxvi. 9). It is enough for us to be subject to the powers that be, after the example of Christ, "Rendering to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's." For God is able to work out His own purposes, and He will accomplish them. Let us seek devotedly and intelligently to understand the claims of Christ upon us. His commands are sovereign, and His claims supreme.

There is a motive in every rational action. Sometimes ambition prompts; sometimes avarice sways; but with the true, earnest, and devoted Christian it is the love of God—the love of Christ that constraineth. Some dominant motive rules in the life of everyone; with some it is evil, with some it is good. But the true Christian says with St. Paul, "I know in whom I have believed, and for me to live is Christ; to die is gain." He lives, he labours, he obeys, he suffers, all for the Lord's sake. Oh, the height of heroism, the depth of devotion, and the labour of love, comprehended in that word, "for the Lord's sake." What would we not do; what would we not suffer, "for the Lord's sake." But "Christ has left us an example that we should

walk in His steps." He did not "cry nor strive"; "He did no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth." Such, then, must be the Christian's life. Civil government conduces to the happiness of human beings; and it is the will of God that His creatures should be happy. Let us then be subject to the ordinances of civil government "for the Lord's sake." Our obedience may be the very means used by God for the furtherance of the Gospel of Christ. Let us have our hearts so filled with the love of Christ, that we shall always strive to act on those upright, holy, and self-sacrificing principles on which He acted. Then we may be sure that neither our passions, nor prejudices, nor mistaken zeal will lead us far astray from the Apostolic injunction.

We come next to consider—

III. *The Purpose of Obedience to Civil Government.*—"For so is the will of God that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." This was, perhaps, the chief purpose for which St. Paul urged obedience to civil government. At that day the wealthy Romans lived in luxury, extravagance, and moral corruption. The Pagan religion was at its lowest ebb; the learned only mocked at it, while the ignorant, with few exceptions, utterly disregarded it. Standing before the Roman senate, Cæsar declared, "Beyond this life there is no place for either trouble or joy." And the great Cato, seeking to confirm this language, exclaimed, "Beautifully and excellently has Caius Cæsar spoken in this assembly concerning life and death." The nobler soul of Seneca was sunk in sorrow, as he cried, 'Ah! if one might only have a guide to truth.' This was the state of Roman society into which Christianity was ushered. Among the Greeks there was nothing better. Beautiful Athens had fallen into moral destitution; and fair Corinth had become a byword for its profligacy and licentiousness. How could Christians join in idolatrous revelries and the orgies of the heathen temples? If a man is in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature. They could not offer sacrifice to idols; they could not join in the murderous gladiatorial combats and fightings with wild beasts; they could not wade with shameless companions through the mire of immorality. Therefore, they forsook the heathen temples, and assembled with their brethren on the first day of the week for the breaking of bread, in remembrance of their crucified and risen Lord. So mightily spread Christianity that the temples of idolatry became desolate. Then came not only the hostility and hatred of the Jews, but fearful persecution from the Romans. Almost every conceivable base charge was brought against the Christians. They were accused of being law-breakers, rebellious, seditious, immoral, atheists, murderers, and ready at any moment for insurrection. When they broke bread and drank wine in remembrance of Christ, they were accused of drinking human blood. All these things the

Christians had to meet and to live down. They fled everywhere, but persecution followed them. To these scattered ones St. Peter wrote: "Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake . . . for this is the will of God that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." By obedience they were to prove that they were not bad subjects, nor seditious, nor subverters of the common laws. But they refused to give their substance to support idolatry, and patiently took the spoiling of their goods; yet they willingly rendered tribute and custom to whom tribute and custom were due. And so it must be with us. Christians must live consistent lives, obedient to the laws of God and the ordinances of the civil government, "for the Lord's sake." We must be loyal subjects to the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, steadfast, unmovable, faithful unto death. Then, standing before an assembled universe and the mighty Judge eternal, we shall hear the glad words, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Amen.

THE Bishop of Wakefield will be abroad on his holiday from August 1 until the second week of September.

THE announcement that the Principal of Brasenose, Oxford, is going to resign in October has come as a surprise on the University generally; it is so short a time since his election that it was hoped he would have consented to hold the office for a time longer, while his extreme accuracy and business capacity would have made him a valuable Vice-Chancellor if the time had come when it would have been his turn to succeed to that post. However, whatever hopes were entertained on this score, Mr. Watson has by his resignation put an end to; and the University will probably have to look for a substitute for him as Vice-Chancellor among the men of a younger generation. Indeed, one of the most noteworthy changes which have come over Oxford in recent years has been the comparatively early age at which men have been elected to become heads of houses. The change has, as is usually the case, its advantages and its disadvantages. On the one hand, the election of younger heads has caused the somewhat absurd cry which was raised ten or fifteen years ago, for the abolition of the office, entirely to disappear; it has provided a certain number of men still in their prime with posts in which they have the leisure to prosecute original research if they have a mind to do so; and it has made the office of head of a college a more real and active post than it used to be; it has opened up a possible future for some of the college tutors. On the other hand, a young and vigorous man, finding the duties of the headship comparatively light, is tempted to take somewhat more than his fair share of the rather fussy business of endless committees by which the University is—the late Rector of Lincoln used so bitterly to complain—only too much distracted.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all **Pulmonary**
Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR
 THE
Voice,
Throat,
Chest,
and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illus-
 trated Pamphlet with copies of Thou-
 sands of Testimonials
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1889.

"FOLLOW MY LEADER."

THE old English game which is known by this title exemplifies one of the pervading traits of character in mankind. Man is not simply gregarious, but imitative. The human animal will not be driven, it must be led. This is Nature's demand, though it is our ambition to lead others rather than to be led ourselves. The real leaders are few and far between, not because every man would not be a leader if he could, but because to very few is given that intuitive perception of what is passing in other men's minds, which alone can qualify us to take the lead and draw our fellows after us. The power to discern, and the gift of language wherein to clothe the thoughts and wishes, the hopes and fears of our fellow men, with the firmness needful to act promptly when requisite, this combination of talents is indispensable, and very rarely met with in its full development; whereas its abuse, as seen in the swindler and the sharper, is a common curse to society. The true leader, with "nicely calculated less or more," will balance the passions, impulses, and deeper feelings of his followers. They cannot do this effectually themselves, so he does it for them. So long as he retains their confidence they will follow unquestioningly. There are blind leaders of the blind everywhere; but once let them run against a stone wall and their office is gone. The good instincts are easily aroused, and the weaker the mind, the greater the danger of being misled. In things mundane fashion reigns supreme—to start the fashion brings a blessing or a curse with it both on the leader and the led. In ecclesiastical, medical, political and social affairs there is a fashion peculiar

to each, and changing with the hour. We have what are called epidemics of crime; and first one, then another form of sport is "all the rage." The leaders of the Oxford movement are undoubtedly to be held responsible on the one hand for a stirring up of Churchmen to a greater interest in the outward and visible accessories of religion, as well as the improved organisation of Church work; and on the other for a craving after the husk rather than the kernel. True as it is that the shell covers the nut, we rather think that to reach it the shell has to be broken, not gilded to attract the eye to itself. With the reredos before us we are tempted to enquire whether the patron saint of our Metropolitan Cathedral would consider the cause of truth likely to be best served by legal contention or peace with honour. Certainly the principle contended for need not be given up though the battle were refused. The originators of the Hospital Saturday movement have struck the right chord by engaging the services of lady collectors in our streets. It is not merely giving them something to do, but it is something out of the common, and affords them an opportunity of turning their good looks and good manners to useful account. Anent the medical side of our subject, we may remark that the late Duke of Albany led the way nobly when he laid the foundation stone of the National Hospital for the paralysed and epileptic in its present enlarged form, this being the first hospital in the kingdom devoted to that widely prevalent class of diseases affecting the brain and nervous system. Of political leaders the grand old woodchopper of Hawarden furnishes a sad instance of the work of a master mind being undone by self-deception and metaphysical subtleties. Possessing the power of persuasion and the gift of plausible speech in unusually strong combination, for years he had only to say "Follow your leader," and many thousands were ready to believe his promises. So long as he kept to the straight path he retained their confidence, but at length they perceive that he is lost in the maze of his own scheming and plotting. Having nothing but rhetoric to offer, the more intelligent among the lower orders begin to regard him as a shaven Samson, and notice that the Irish question has turned his brain; whilst the duller ones object to running their own heads against a stone wall for the sake of imitating his example. In the eighth Whitechapel murder we shudder to recognise the work of a maniac or a fiend who has led the way in the epidemic of crime, which shows itself at one time in the murder and suicide of lovers, at another in the dissembling of the slow poisoner, at a third in crimes of "Jack the Ripper" type. On the other hand, turning from grave to gay, we see men like Dr. Grace heading the record of our good old English cricket score, and the University crews stimulating oarsmen to put forward their strength in the exhilarating sport which gives life and animation to our rivers

and lakes. Or we may look on while the young people of both sexes engage in what has now attained the rank of a national recreative institution—the self-propelling cyclist's ride. This is an exercise suited for one or all of the seven days in the week. It gives its votary a good appetite, and a clear head to start fresh at his work, or to take part in divine worship. We can see no objection, where the roads are good, to the country parson riding from one church to the other on Sundays if he please. His machine gives no trouble to man or beast; but saves time and re-invigorates the frame. Two years ago the Vicar of Ripley started a service for cyclists on Sunday afternoons, which is invariably well attended. The cycle can be profitably used in all the seven decades of life, as we are reminded by a well got-up card from Messrs. Humber and Co., depicting "the seven ages of cycling," from the ten-year-old boy on a miniature "Cripper," and the youth of twenty on a "Safety," to the white-haired veteran on a tricycle. For students especially this sport is invaluable, as it promotes health by causing the wheels of the internal machinery to revolve in easy and regular rotation. The military use of the cycle shows, moreover, that in *work* as well as in play it leads the vanguard of pedestrianism.

BELLICOSE "BOYS' BRIGADES."

A CONTEMPORARY remarks:—"The Boys' Brigade is getting on rapidly, especially in Scotland. It professes to be a purely volunteer organisation, but there is reason to believe that the scheme was incubated at the War Office, under the auspices of Lord Wolseley and the Duke of Cambridge. Scotland was the birthplace of the peculiar movement, which is really borrowed from France. Visitors to Paris are familiar with the brigades of boys who frequently march through the streets armed with mimic rifles, the object of the Government being to promote the military spirit. Such brigades are now being formed throughout this country, and we regret to say that the movement has fastened itself like a parasite upon many of our Sunday-schools. There is something almost blasphemous in the way in which the religion of the Prince of Peace is mixed up with the Pagan militarism of Lord Wolseley. The drill practice of these boy brigades is opened with prayer, and they are taught to sing such processional hymns as 'Onward, Christian soldiers,' till they readily confound killing with the fight against sin. Probably they would not stop at rifle practice; for we note that, at the annual exhibition at Elgin, the birthplace of this movement, a rev. gentleman, in speaking in laudatory terms of military drill, said 'he would like to see everything connected with the art of self-defence taught, including boxing and everything else. He did not

think any boy was worth much unless he was able to knock down a fellow as big as himself.' We always understood that there were many survivals of Paganism in the extreme North of Scotland; so we are not greatly surprised that the rev. gentleman kicks aside the Sermon on the Mount with contempt. It is not impossible that his aspirations will be realised. Already we have rifle drill opened with praise and prayer in some of our London Sunday-schools; it is but a step to a merry mill without gloves by two big boys in the senior Bible class, with teachers as bottle-holders and the superintendent, as referee, closing the proceedings with the benediction."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SIR,—Your correspondent P. D. has started a discussion which, if properly conducted, may result in much good. I think that we take too much on credit, and that it is a good thing to examine for ourselves from time to time, the reasons for the things that be. We have allowed, for instance, the question of Church Government to be a settled one; and we admit that no other form but our own is Scriptural. And things are not so.

Nothing is clearer to my mind than that there is no form of Church Government prescribed in Scripture. This statement will probably shock some of your readers. That, however, I cannot help. The statement is true. A form of Church Government seems to have existed? True, but it is nowhere insisted upon as essential. If so, it will be an easy matter to specify. The inference from this is that Church Government does not affect the faith. It is not of the nature of an article of faith.

Is it expedient? That is altogether another question. But it is one that has many sides. I used to think that the congregation ought to have some voice in the selection of its minister till I witnessed in Scotland how this matter split the congregation up into so many cliques, each wishing to have its own way. After that I had my doubts. And when one sees bishops lording it, as they too often do, over God's heritage, it is difficult to form a correct opinion. So long as human nature is what it is, it will always be difficult, in many cases, to determine what is best.

But what is the view of the English Church? We have not three orders, but two. These are deacons and priests. The bishop is a priest after his consecration. The priest is no longer a deacon. All this is seen in the fact that the services are for the "ordering" of deacons and priests, and for the "consecration" of the bishops. In other words a bishop is an elder among his equals. The word priest, from its derivation, implies no sacrificial function, and bishop should imply no more than overlooker. There is nothing in the terms whence it may be inferred that either bishops or priests are agents of heaven. Perhaps, if this were remembered, modesty and meekness would obtain more largely amongst us.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, July 20th, 1889.

P.S.—May I be allowed to say, anent the discussion on the "The Fatherhood of God": (1) Man chooses to reject God's offers of mercy. (2) We must accept God's plain teaching found in the Bible. (3) Man may not substitute his opinions for God's Word. (4) Dogma must be the basis of faith, "whatever good and devoted (?) men," may say. (5) It is a pity Mr. Murphy's views are not as Scriptural as his poetry is beautiful.

THE IRISH CHURCH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—Let me begin with a personal matter. "C. P. M." writes in the PULPIT of the 20th, "Mr. Murphy is evidently angry with me" (for some remarks which are in substance repeated in his letter which you now publish). If I wrote as if I was angry, I must apologise, for I could not be angry with so fair a controversialist.

Canon Crosthwaite writes in the same PULPIT that in the disestablished Church of Ireland "the Evangelical party gave up our Lord's incarnation, or at least the necessity of holding it." What does this mean? True or false, no one has a right to make such a charge in an indefinite way.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 22nd July, 1889.

SIR,—I beg seriously and earnestly to remonstrate with you concerning the admission into your paper of such letters as that of Mr. Crosthwaite, which contains slanders against the Church of Ireland in connection with its Prayer Book, which slanders have been repeatedly, by myself and others, shown to be unjustified and without foundation. If yours were an Irish paper and read in this country only, such letters would be harmless, for they would be disregarded; your English readers cannot be expected to know that.

I am not appealing to Mr. Crosthwaite to abstain from his offensiveness, for he has repeated his fabrications so often that perhaps he by this time believes them himself; I am appealing to you, Mr. Editor, to cease, for the sake of truth and common decorum, to give him opportunities of airing his offensiveness.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

Dublin, 20th July, 1889.

REVIEW OF "GOD'S MINISTRY," ETC.

SIR,—Will you allow me to protest against some statements in this review in your last number?

1. The Reviewer says, St. Paul was ordained by Prophets, etc. (Acts xiii. 1—3). Hear what Potter says, "Church Government" ch. 5, p. 249. London: Tegg, 1852. "This imposition of hands on Paul and Barnabas was a solemn benediction on their ministry of preaching the Gospel in a particular circuit, to which they were then sent by the Holy Spirit's direction. Hence it is called in the next chapter a recommendation to the grace of God for the work which they are said to have fulfilled (Acts xiv. 26.) So that this was not their ordination to the Apostolic office, because the end, for which it was given, is here said to be fulfilled, whereas their Apostolic office lasted as long as their lives." Thus "Peter and John were sent by the college of the Apostles to Samaria to confirm the new converts and settle the Church there." But, at

the end of the review, we have what is worse still. "The Church of Christ is not the externally organised body, which bears that name, whose membership can be proved by the production of a baptismal certificate, and whose supernatural graces are possessed by all who have a letter of orders." See article xix, which defines the visible Church. What the writer means by supernatural graces does not appear. He goes on thus—Our Lord "Himself said positively and decidedly in the most solemn moments of His life that it was no external body." When? Surely not when He said, "My kingdom is not of this world," or when He spoke of His return "Lo here! or Lo there!" "This body is the aggregate of all true and virtuous men, who may be known by their works to belong to Christ." Why, this description would include Socrates and all heathens living up to their light. I might remark on other things in this review; but this will suffice for the present as a protest.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. & V.-G. of Kildare.

THE WAYSIDE FLOWERS.

PLUCK not the wayside flowers,
Blooming in beauty there;
Hedgerows are Nature's bowers,
Which all alike may share.

Pluck not the wayside flowers
Some wanderer vain
May, in his weary hours,
See them and turn again.

Pluck not the wayside flowers,
For some despairing one,
When sheltering from the showers,
May bless them, and hope on.

Pluck not the wayside flowers,
God's gifts to great and small,
Which summer ever dowers
In love upon us all.

JOHN W. KAYE.

THE Rev. A. W. Jephson, vicar of St. John's, Waterloo Road, was one of the speakers at a Wesleyan meeting recently held at Clapham in connection with the opening of a new lecture-hall and "church parlour," and said he was delighted to be with any Christian congregation who were enlarging their borders in the manner which he had just witnessed. If only the Methodists of Clapham could impart a little of their fire and enthusiasm to some other Churches of which he knew he would be very glad. When one had lived in London for a bit, one began to see with larger eyes, and that was why he was glad to meet any Church that was doing God's work. There was more work for Christians to do in London than there were Christians to do it, he feared.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anderson, Rev. J., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Whitehaven.
Blackley, Rev. Canon W. L., Vicar of King's Somborne; Vicar of James-the-Less, Westminster.
Bowden-Smith, Rev. Frederick Hermann, Rector of Weston-Patrick, Odiham; Rector of Highclere, Hants.
Brabazon, Rev. J., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Immortalité*.

Braithwaite, Rev. P. R. P., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Jersey; Vicar of Andover, Hants.
Buller, Rev. Spencer Richard Arthur, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Bushey-heath, Herts.
Buzzard, Rev. T. A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Preston; Vicar of St. Michael's, Grimsargh, near Preston.
Chute, Rev. T. D., M.A., Rector of Great Moulton, Norfolk.
Cooper, Rev. E. B., Chaplain of Amersham Union Workhouse.
Davies, Rev. Robert O., B.D., Rector of Kettleburgh; Chaplain to the Plomesgate Union, Suffolk.
Draper, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Alfreton; Vicar of Holy Cross, Shrewsbury.
Duthoit, Rev. H. C., Vicar of Brill-with-Boarstall, Bucks.
Evans, Rev. J. Tyssul, Vicar of Pyle; Vicar of Bettws-y-Rhos, Abergele.
Fisher, Rev. George Carnac, Vicar of St. Mary's, Beverley; Vicar of Croydon.
Gathercole, Rev. Charles William Augustus, B.A., Vicar of Cornworthy, Devonshire.
Gough, Rev. Edwin Spencer, M.A., Rector of Barningham; Rural Dean of the Northern Division of Richmond.
Hayes, Rev. William Ambrose, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's Accrington; Vicar of St. James's, Accrington.
Hodge, Rev. John Mackey, M.A., Chaplain to the Three Towns Cemetery, Plymouth.
Holderness, Rev. Hedley James, B.A., Licensed Preacher within the Diocese of Manchester.
Hopkins, Rev. George Hanslip, M.A., Vicar of Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire; Rector of Chigwell Row, Essex.
Hunt, Rev. D. J. S., M.A., Vicar of Sprowston, Norfolk.
Jacob, Rev. T. W. H., lately Chaplain at Turin; Vicar of Shirley, near Southampton.
Jay, Rev. Willie Parkinson, M.A., Rector of Toppesfield, Essex.
Johnson, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Prebendary of Kerswell in Exeter Cathedral.
King, Rev. A. E., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of the Clare College Mission, Rotherhithe; Vicar of St. Philip's, Sydenham.
Kirkby, Rev. John, B.A., Senior Curate of St. Cleopas's, Liverpool, S.; Curate-in-Charge of Santan, Isle of Man.
Kynaston, Rev. Herbert, D.D., Vicar of St. Luke's, Kentish Town, London; Greek Professor in Durham University and Canon of Durham.
Linton, Rev. George, Vicar of Corsham; English Chaplain at Bonn-on-the-Rhine.
Longbottom, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Matthew's, Burley, Leeds.
Mercer, Rev. John Edward, M.A., Rector of St. Michael's, Manchester.
Peach, Rev. Philip Herbert Wentworth, B.A., Rector of Elstree, Herts.
Peto, Rev. Alfred Henry, M.A., Curate of St. James's, Stockton; Vicar of Sykehonse, Yorkshire.
Pruen, Rev. H. B., Vicar of Moreton Valence, Gloucestershire.
Rawlinson, Rev. Henry John, M.A., Rector of Bicton, Devonshire.
Roberson, Rev. H., M.A., Curate; Rector of St. Margaret's, Durham.
Shepherd, Rev. Ernest Chater, B.A., Curate of Morpeth; Vicar of Sand Hutton, Yorkshire.
Wace, Rev. Henry, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, Principal of King's College, London, and Hon. Chaplain to the Queen; Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majesty.
Walker, Rev. J. R., Naval Instructor to the *Inconstant*.
Whigham, Rev. Laurence R., M.A., LL.B., Incumbent of Southbourne-on-Sea, Hants; Honorary Organising Secretary for the Diocese of Grahamstown, S. Africa.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bond, Rev. Nathaniel, of Creech Grange, Rector of Steple and Tyneham, and Canon of Salisbury, at Creech Grange, in the Isle of Purbeck, aged 48.
Bryans, Rev. William, late Vicar of Tarvin (for thirty-four years), at King's Garden, Eltham, on the 18th inst., in his 68th year.
Bush, Rev. James, M.A., late Rector of Ousby, at Buckyeats, Windermere, on the 16. inst., aged 72.
Garde, Rev. Thomas Hugh, M.A., T.C.D., at the Rectory, Shenley Mansel, Bletchley, on the 22nd inst.
Venables, Rev. Henry, at 26, Norham-gardens, Oxford, on the 20th inst., aged 65.



The Church of England Pulpit.

LIFE AND CHARACTER.—THE "GOING FORTH" OF MAN.

BY THE REV. H. S. SWITHINBANK, M.A., VICAR
OF ST. SAVIOUR'S, DENMARK PARK, S.E.

SERMON PREACHED IN CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL,
AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE KING'S
SCHOOL, ON 1ST AUGUST, 1889.

"He appointed the moon for certain seasons, and the sun knoweth his going down.

"Thou makest darkness, that it may be night, wherein all the beasts of the forest do move.

"The lions, roaring after their prey, do seek their meat from God.

"The sun ariseth, and they get them away together, and lay them down in their dens.

"Man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening."—PSALM civ. 19—24.

IT is a section of a great panorama. First comes darkness: it is night. And night has a life of its own. Wild beasts creep forth: the young lions roar after their prey, the older and more wary prowl stealthily around. Then the sun ariseth, and the denizens of night leave the stage free for something higher. Upon this picture of restless noisy night in the wilds comes a sketch of still life, the calm round of human toil in the quiet light of day:—"Man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening." The sketch is not without a colouring of its own. The hues of sunrise set man on his way. The hues of sunset see him home.

"Man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening." It describes human life, no words more beautifully—human life as a whole. And it describes each part of that whole. Man has many "goings forth until the evening," one within the other. Every day, every week, every term is a fresh going forth to work till the time of rest. All life is rhythmic: it has rhythm within rhythm, waste and renewal, day and night, work and holiday. At school, if anywhere, one felt it. And you who remain, while boys come and go, as leaf replaces leaf on an evergreen tree, you may find stealing over you some sense of a still vaster rhythm within rhythm—life, Cosmos, GOD, till

"Our noisy years seem moments in the being of the eternal silence."

—each busy term, as it were, one tick of the "horologe of eternity."

It is the very pulse of life, this incessant "going forth." The going forth from the Heart of the
Vol. XXVIII.—No. 710.

Eternal—a man is born, "going forth to his work and to his labour until the evening." The going forth from the mother's side—the child becomes a boy. The going forth from home—he goes to school. The going forth from school into a wider world "until the evening." And then, "last scene of this eventful history" (yet how do we know it is the last?), the going forth from the schoolboy phase of earthly life into the "full-grown energies" of the great Hereafter.

To which of those many goings forth shall we turn first this morning?

One there is that to-day presents itself unsought as one looks down the lines of those who are now in the school. To most of you this is the last day of term. To some it is the last day of school. You, my brethren, in an hour or two will be standing quite at the watershed, where, in most men's lives, the waters of life part. However rich the scenery on both sides, an actual watershed is usually bare and dull. How well one remembers the sinking of heart, the blank and lonely feeling, when one's last school speech-day was over! You can at least do this; you can take your bearings. You are going forth (as we say) "from school to life." A loose and misleading phrase. What you enter is no more life than what you leave. And it is school quite as much. It is hardly a figure of speech to talk of the "school of life," so really is life a school. Throughout you are passing from one school to another school, like Hugh Miller with his "Schools and Schoolmasters." You may be going as Abram went forth "not knowing whither he went." God will show. Whatever and wherever it be, the lasting value of your next school will largely depend on how you take it. "Man goeth forth." I go forth. To do what? Merely to push and strive? Merely to get out of life what present good or pleasure I can? Or, to continue my education for higher things?

Thank God, you are not left to yourself. There is a great "going forth of man" we have yet to take into account.

The text, we have seen, describes our life. It describes also the Life of our life. "Man goeth forth." We rise on that word "man" to the Man, Man of men—the Son of Man—and there our thoughts may for a moment rest. His "goings forth" are "from everlasting." Yet in time and for a time He goeth forth a Man among men. Day after day sees Him go forth to quiet work in a village home. The time comes, and He leaves the life of home, never to return, "going forth" (again and again the word is used) to each department of that wider work for which He is "come forth" from the Father. So the Son of Man goeth forth until the evening; at eventide he reaches Calvary, and there, when dark night has closed upon the human soul, He "accomplishes His decease," His exodus, His going forth from this world.

Is not that, for the most part, your life "writ

large"? But we cannot stop here. It is not half way. Back to our text and context!

The "going forth" of man is more than the last scene of a panorama. It is the highest point in a great upward movement that runs through the Psalm. The creation of light, the shaping of the earth, the growth of plant and animal, all have been rising towards this. We have an oratorio of Creation, and here is its climax. Note how, until this verse, God is the sole agent. The winds and the waters are sent forth by Him; He "causeth the grass to grow"; He "bringeth forth food out of the earth," the very lions "seek their meat from" Him. Did not our grammars once tell us (do they so still?) that nouns neuter have no true nominative? But man goeth forth—(a distinction is clearly meant)—goeth forth, a self-conscious agent, an ego, a person. The "going forth" of man in the dignity of man, crowns the visible creation. And now the Psalmist bursts out: "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast Thou made them all. The earth is full of Thy riches." Those "manifold riches"—matter and power and life—are the field into which, with his high commission, "man goeth forth."

So far Nature. On that topmost step of Nature's stairway, one takes one's stand with the man of science. One follows his gaze as he points downwards: it is step below step to the very bottom, not every step visible, but every single one credible to those who know the Creator's power. And then, one turns round and points upwards. Oh, it is no poet's dream that, this going forth of man, the top step of one stairway, is also the lowest step of another, sloping through the darkness up to God!

And yet not another; for, up or down, we are upon the great altar-stairs of being. One points up and tells how that going forth of the Son of Man, crowning the natural, was the going forth of God Himself, planting on earth the supernatural. For when the God-Man went forth from this world, it was to set up that higher flight of the great stairway. The first was from dust to man, the second from man to God.

So we are not left to ourselves. The ladder of angels is not a dream or a picture, but a great fact. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see" it. And we see it now. It is much that we gathered there (!) this morning, much that on this day we have been in closest touch with that humanity by which alone we can rise to the Divine. We, least of any, have been left to ourselves in the past—we Canterbury boys—and if only we are steadfast and look up, we shall not be left to ourselves now. Man goeth forth. Year after year this school, this Cathedral, sends forth its men, charged with its own spirit. Some of you are very young, but your time will come. And when it comes it must find you full-ready. There is more at stake than the honour of a great school. You

will be answerable for all that these surroundings did and might have done.

For we who have "gone forth" can tell you that Canterbury is more to us than a group of holy and happy memories, though such memories do have "no small or trivial influence" on the "best portion" of one's life. It is far more than that. There is one thing about work which, as boys, we could not understand:—"Man goeth forth to his work," but not for the work's sake. The true end of work is character, stamping on my soul the will of God for me. And here, to change the metaphor, the lines of character are laid down to a scale, and design drawn by the very genius of the place. A Canterbury man may find himself launched into strange waters, he may then drift from his moorings, drag his anchors, he may be storm-tossed and battered. But he can never quite lose—he can never quite lose (praise God for it!) those first lines of character. A Canterbury man (if he be true to his old self) never can be other than reverent, never can forget what the present owes to the past, nor ignore the claim that the future has upon the present. He never can be narrow-minded, must always be broad-hearted. He has been placed, with every circumstance of hallowing association, at the one point of sight from which a man can be more than tolerant without being less than true, can be at once deeply reverent and ardent for progress. That one point of sight is the higher stairway that leads to God; he has learnt to stand there, he knows where he is, he knows his Church, One Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, as in his Creed he declares.

The "Theologian from the school of Cambridge on the Charles," of whom Longfellow writes, might well have hailed from Canterbury:—

"With reverend feet the earth he trod,
Nor banished Nature from his plan,
But studied still with deep research
To build the Universal Church,
Lofty as is the love of God,
And ample as the wants of man."*

And when one hears the old familiar bells, when one sees, if only from a rushing train, the grey majesty of Bell Harry tower, "Look," they seem to say, "Look unto the rock whence you are hewn, And to the hole of the pit whence you are digged."

There is one Old King's scholar, this year much in our thoughts, whose career may seem to give the lie to much that I have been saying. To some it might seem right to treat Christopher Marlowe as an exception and a warning. I prefer to deal differently. That soul had a history (could we only read it) which might really help us King's School men of to-day. A man with an intense inner self, a man (amid all failings) reaching after the unattainable—in fact, a true artist and so

* "Tales of a Wayside Inn."—Prelude.

far a true man—that appears to be the modern judgment of him. And I seem to spell out some thing of the real Marlowe when I take up Doctor Faustus. There is one line in that play which puts the history of a soul in ten short words: in the last scene, that terrible scene, when the clock has struck eleven and the awful hour draws all too swiftly near,

“O, I’ll leap up to my God,”

is the agonized cry (does it not come from the deep of the poet’s own soul?)

“O, I’ll leap up to my God. Who pulls me down?” You have there one more “going forth of man,” his going forth towards the ideal.

“O, I *will* leap up to my God.”—The man within the man claiming to be free, asserting his right to the ideal, asserting it against all that would keep him under.—“Who pulls me down?”

It is a noble picture. How much more noble than the modern “Faust,” becomes clear as one gazes upon it. The play grows dim, Marlowe stands out; it is a soul like ours, with an ear ever open to the good angel’s whisper, a soul that is never self-satisfied, but ever “going forth,” “straining forward to the things which are before.”

And Browning may be right: “Tis not what man Does which exalts him, but what man Would do.”

“That little man seeks a little thing to do,

Sees it and does it;

That high man, with a great thing to pursue,

Dies ere he knows it.*

But the “going forth” must be “until the evening.” No slackening! Slackness is the pitfall of many a high soul. To your work and to your labour until the evening!

“Be the day weary, or be the day long,
At last the bell ringeth to evensong.”

“As day hath its evening, so also hath life.” The night cometh. It may fall, as in our Northern climes, almost imperceptibly; or it may, as on the Southern seas, “come rushing down from heaven.” Fall as it may, ’tis not how a man dies, but how he has lived—poor Kit Marlowe notwithstanding. Away with the “Memento mori”! Life is no Egyptian feast. Not “Memento mori,” but “Memento vivere”! Point us to life! That is the true “going forth” of man; life here, the day’s labour: life hereafter, the wages—true life, that is not the slave of habit, but habit’s master—a “life unto God; and “that life is in His Son.”

THE Bishop of Chester has appointed the Rev. Wilfrid John Richmond, M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the diocese of Chester. Mr. Richmond was formerly tutor of Keble College, Oxford, and subsequently Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, and is the author of a work on *Christian Economics*.

* “Grammarians’ Funeral.”

“TRUE CHRISTIAN ZEAL.”

BY THE REV. JOHN SPENCE, B.D., INCUMBENT.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE MARINERS’ PARISH CHURCH, BELFAST, ON SUNDAY, JULY 7TH, 1889.

“The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.”—ST. JAMES i. 20.

ZEAL for God and for His truth, animated by a pure motive, and governed by knowledge and discretion, is a virtue of the noblest quality. But like all other things of genuine merit it suffers from hosts of spurious imitations. Some of these are very close copies, and often pass for the genuine article, but many of them are poor specimens of the imitator’s art, and indicate innocence of any personal knowledge of the real coin. These spurious imitations have, in every age of the Church, produced untold evil. The Christian community to which St. James addressed this letter was evidently suffering from the presence of persons very zealous in the propagation of their notions—ready, voluble talkers, but indisposed to hear and learn. It would have been well if the family had become extinct with that generation; but, alas, it lives and has come down to us, growing with the Church’s growth. These people were evidently a weight on the Apostle’s mind. Their tongue was deadly poison, unbridled and untamed. Such religionists do not stop here. Endeavouring to propagate their own idea under the delusion that they are truth’s sole guardians, they come face to face with those who differ from them. This they cannot brook. Their opponents are the enemies of God, and must be put down. Angry feeling and abuse take the place of argument. They become not only heated, but wrathful and violent—as far as in their power persecutors. And all this in the name of religion and for the cause of truth and righteousness. To all such the Apostle said then and the Apostle says now, “Be swift to hear, slow to speak—slow to wrath, for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.” We observe here the high aim with which St. James accredits the professors of religion. He takes for granted that their object in life is the working out of the righteousness of God. This we infer from the fact that he assumes it is a sufficient condemnation of any course of conduct to assure them this purpose was not attained by it. Here, however, it may be asked, what are we to understand by the righteousness of God? Does it mean personal holy living, such as God demands, and without which it is impossible to see Him? Or are we to take the expression “righteousness of God” here as the equivalent of St. Paul’s righteousness of faith—God’s way of saving men—the imputation of their faith, for righteousness. No doubt both are included, but the latter is the thought directly involved in the text. But “the

righteousness of faith" is only another way of saying the Gospel of Christ. To work the righteousness of God, therefore, means to live and labour for the promotion and extension of the Gospel. To seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness. What a high purpose. How worthy of men redeemed by Christ and baptised into His name. And yet no lower aim is compatible with the Christian profession, and an apostle cannot admit the thought of Christians aiming lower. Is it this for which we are living? Is it with this purpose we intend meeting to-morrow? Is this, even to-day, our first consideration and the motive with which we have come together? Must we not admit that lower motives animate many who take an active part in these anniversary gatherings? That bigotry, pride, boasting, envy, hatred, wrath, possess the breasts of some, thank God not all and not the majority, but some of those who call themselves by the name of Protestants, Orangemen, Christians. Be this as it may with others, let it not be so with us. The Christian must aim at the righteousness of God. But here arises the question, how are Christian people to promote this object—by what means are they to seek its attainment? That there should be any question about this matter may well seem strange to many. "Surely," I think I hear them say, "the means must in motive and in manner be in keeping with the end." Yet we all know the question has been discussed. We know, too, that it is openly affirmed that one of the most powerful and far-reaching societies in Christendom is founded on the maxim that "the end justifies the means." And I presume we are all only too familiar with the fact that many governments and many individuals who profess to hate the principle only too often yield to the temptation in practice, just as those who most loudly proclaim their hatred of intolerance often fail to live up to their profession when power is placed in their hands. This is only human nature, unregenerate and unsanctified, and need not surprise us. It was so in apostolic times. St. Paul had to proclaim the damnation of those who said "Let us do evil that good may come." St. James had to proclaim to those half-educated prating, unteachable bigots of the Church to which he wrote, and who thought God was glorified by their persecuting spirit, that "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." This spirit has wrought ruin in every age of the Church, and to day it lives not only among our enemies, of whom we cannot fairly expect better, but among ourselves, with an open Bible in our hands and the life of Christ before us. Every form of intolerance partakes of it. Every attempt to overawe and coerce the consciences of men is imbued with it. Every threat, every appeal to arms, is in some degree the outcome of it. But it has ever failed, and must ever fail. The effect of man's wrath, if in power, may make hypocrites, but it cannot make

true converts. Men can only be awakened, converted, saved, by rational argument, by the persuasion of love, by the effective eloquence of a Christlike life, by the force of truth, accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit. But what deludes men, blinds men, perverts men's judgment so that they can entertain for a moment the idea that their jealousy, bigotry, malice striving, persecution could in any way further the righteousness of God? It seems to me that a glance at the context throws light on this problem. (a) We are reminded that every good gift is from above—from God. Why, think ye, does the Apostle deem it necessary to remind the Church of this? There can only be one reason—the proneness of Christian people to regard their gifts and endowments as their own, or as something to which they have a right, and so think themselves better than others. Let this spirit once get hold of a man or of a Church, and disregard for the rights of others will soon develop itself. The Pharisaic prayer, the Pharisaic pride, and the Pharisaic temper are ever found associated. (b) Again, the Apostle enjoins that we be doers of the Word, not hearers only, deceiving our own souls. Why this earnest appeal? St. James evidently saw the terrible possibility of men being content with hearing, with a creed, with orthodoxy, while the heart remained unsanctified and the life unholy. This is no longer a mere possibility; it is a practical reality. We meet at every turn men "who hold the truth in unrighteousness," men who boast that they are not Papist, that they are free from the mummeries of modern Babylon, that they don't turn bread into a god, or prostrate themselves before graven images; yet they can trample on every precept of the law, take God's name in vain, violate the sanctity of the Lord's Day for their own pleasure or gain; commit adultery, drink to be drunken, live in pleasure, and pamper the flesh. And is it not the testimony of all history and all experience these are the persons who, as a rule, are the apostles of intolerance, seeking no doubt to cover with their zeal what is lacking in their lives? (c) Again, we are commanded to "be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath." There must have been some good and sufficient reason for this urgent appeal. Are we not justified in considering it was called forth by the absence of that meekness, retirement, and holiness which must ever characterise true discipleship: and the presence of an undue and unrestrained desire for public place, and a disposition to fret and fume if that desire were not gratified—a giving way to lust for dignity and position, for place and power? Everyone who studies human nature knows what a blinding influence this is, and into what depths of ignominy and what extremes of party zeal and hatred it is wont to lead men. They are zealous for truth, for purity, for righteousness for God. Yes, that is the pretence, but the covered aim is revenge, and the

motive envy, spite and wrath. But it may be asked, are we to sit down and tamely submit to the dictation of every comer? Is there no heresy to be exposed and banished? Are there no ravening wolves from whom the sheep and lambs of the fold are to be protected? Is there to be no zeal and no avowal of fidelity to truth—no earnestly contending for the faith? Are we to allow the Church of God to be attacked, and offer no defence? Are we to allow our rights and liberties to be wrested from our grasp without a struggle? Are the walls of Zion to be stormed, and the citadel of truth to be entered, and no attempt made to hold the fort and expel the foe? Need I answer these questions? There are most certainly false teachers. The sheep and lambs of the flock demand our protection. Fidelity to truth must be evinced, the Church of Christ defended against every comer, and the enemy dislodged from the citadel of liberty and of truth. But how? By the arm of the flesh? by carnal weapons? by fire and sword? by the wrath of man? Most certainly not. "Put up thy swords," cried our Holy Redeemer as His rash disciple drew it under circumstances which, if any circumstance ever could, justified its use, and in the same solemn moment He added the momentous warning, which His Church has but too sadly neglected—"All that take the sword shall perish with the sword." And what is our text to-day but a free translation of our Lord's warning? Yes, brethren, I beseech you believe it, the narrowness, the selfishness, the bigotry, the intolerance, the wrath of man can never bring you one step toward the attainment of your grand and noble aim—the righteousness of God, the extension of His Church, the emancipation of mankind, the enlightenment and salvation of the race. But the Apostle does not leave us with a negative statement. He proceeds to show how this aim is to be realised. "Wherefore lay aside the overflowing of filthiness and receive with meekness the implanted Word, which is able to save your souls." There is here presented that double action which meets us both in the Old and New Testament, "Cease to do evil, learn to do well;" "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord;" "Let us put off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light." "Put off the old man which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lust, and put on the new man." And here "lay aside the overflowing of filthiness and receive the implanted Word." The principle is universal. It admits of no exceptions. If we will draw nigh to God, all sin must be forsaken. If as Christian people we wish to work the righteous of God and advance His cause, all that savours of the flesh—envy, pride, selfishness, wrath, must be put away from us. Our zeal must be holy, our motives spiritual, and the animating agent charity. The spirit in which we approach men propagates itself; wrath begets wrath, and love

begets love. But we must not forget that there is the positive side of this two-fold duty. Evil must be put away, suppressed, trampled upon. But this is not all. The implanted Word must be embraced. It is implanted in the Church, it is preached in the world, but it must be believed and embraced by us, or it will have been implanted and preached in vain. But if believingly accepted how glorious the result. Saved—that is enlightened, converted, justified, at peace with God, and animated with the hope of glory. Just as the tiny branch of the good tree, being implanted in the sour, barren stem of the bad tree, and becoming united with it, brings forth fruit according to its own kind, so the Word of God embraced, as by an instrument in the Holy Spirit's hand, renews, sanctifies, saves, and brings forth in our lives love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. And as we are ourselves saved, so only can we save others. "Let him know that he that converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins." We thank God for the light of His truth. We pity those in error—in error of doctrine and in error of life. We want to save them. How is it to be done? Surely not by glorying over them, not by selfish boasting; not by giving way to the overflowing of human wrath, but by inducing them to embrace the truth. But how can we? They won't read our books, they won't listen to our sermons. True, but they will read our lives, they will observe our walk and conversation. If these are characterised by forbearance, by charity—if they are Christlike—they must affect the readers for good. But you say it is hopeless to convert Roman Catholics, they are so bigoted, so prejudiced. They are not more bigoted or more prejudiced than the Jews and Pagans of the apostolic age; and yet a few fishermen and their friends by holy living, patient suffering, and loving teaching won them for Christ and converted the world. Would that our lives were like theirs, our spirit like theirs, our teaching like theirs. Then would the corrupt fountains of society become pure, the forces of evil be arrested, and this sin-trodden and sorely troubled land be restored to peace, and become the home of industry and of godliness. This, and this alone, can bring about the good which we seek, and the end for which we aim. Believe me, all boasting of our power, all self-assertion, all overflowing of man's wrath will prove as ineffectual in our present strifes and tumults as the crying of the bewildered wild birds in the blinding storm to calm the roaring of the surging sea, "for the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God—not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Brethren, Christian brethren, Orange brethren, you will see here the attitude in which we ought to stand, and the action we are in duty bound to take in regard to those from whom we differ, both in

religion and in politics. This evening I hope to be able to point out the great things our God has done for us, and what he demands in return. But it has been and is my anxiety this morning to stir you up, if need be, to the practice of your own and my own avowed principles, not only as Christians, but as Orangemen. Are we not pledged never to give offence, and be slow to take it; to fear and love God; to honour and obey our gracious Sovereign; to be sober, faithful, holy; to read our Bibles; to train our children for God; to bear no malice nor hatred in our hearts; to accord to others what we claim for ourselves—the right of private judgment and liberty to worship God according to our conscience? Yes, these are our principles, but what is our practice? Brethren, we may be maligned, defamed, traduced. Our Master was, and He himself has said, the servant must be content to be as his Lord. But though our reputation is largely at the mercy of the wicked, and may suffer for a time from the tongue of slander, I want to impress upon you that our character, under God's grace, is in our own keeping, and cannot be injured but by ourselves. Let us, therefore, act up to our profession, be true to our God, to ourselves, to our principles. Let us, by patient continuing in well-doing, seek for glory, honour, immortality, eternal life, and put to silence the reproaches of foolish men "as free, yet not using our liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but, as the servants of God, honour all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honour the King." And when life's battle is fought, and life's conflict a thing of the past, when the light of eternity shall have dispelled the mists from the field of strife, we may be found to have slain only our real enemies, the world, the flesh, and the devil, and that long after we are by God's grace crowned more than conquerors, our influence may live on to help others, and though dead to this world, speak still in it for man's good and God's glory.

THE death is announced of the Rev. W. H. Biedermann, late Chancellor and Rural Dean of Connor.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has conferred the degree of Doctor in Music on Henry Faulkner Henniker, Associate of the Royal Academy of Music, Bachelor of Music of the University of Toronto, and organist of Holy Trinity, Maidstone.

AT St. Michael's, Chester-square, has been witnessed the ceremony of the formal reception of a convert—Mari Wilhelmina Zajicek—to the Church of England from the communion of Rome. A special form of service had been drawn up, in the course of which the convert was asked a few questions, the most important of which were—"How many sacraments do you hold?" and "Do you desire to be admitted into the Church of England, believing it to be the Church which is most in accordance with the Word of God?" To the first the convert replied, "Two only, as necessary to salvation, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord;" and to the second an emphatic "I do." Canon Fleming preached the sermon.

Certain HARNESS Cure.

ELECTROPATHIC BELT

FOR
RHEUMATISM

Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co., Ltd.

On y Address,
52, OXFORD ST., LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 3, 1889.

COMPREHENSION HAS ITS LIMITS.

(Communicated.)

NO one could help admiring what the Archbishop of Dublin said in the late Synod in praise of the comprehensiveness of the Irish Church. But there must be a limit—the line must be drawn somewhere. There must be some solid land separated from the sea. At first the whole world was a mixture of land and water; then there was a separation—land on one side, and water on the other. So it must be between truth and error. Where is the line? In our formularies, founded on the sure words of Scripture. Our contentions are chiefly about sacraments, miracles, absolution, inspiration of Scripture, etc. We must have distinct lines: "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further." We must take the language of Scripture literally as it was meant; we must not turn history into fables or poetry. Where an apparent fact in the Old Testament is so referred to in the New, we must not shake this double foundation. We must not fear to believe the miracles, so recorded, and referred to by our Lord and His Apostles. Verbal inspiration, indeed, must be limited to meaning, and not extend to mere words. Words may be doubtful, where the meaning is manifest. As to the sacraments, more must be said. The grace of baptism must be held, but we must be careful to confine it to what is possible to infants and to already converted adults. Conversion cannot be the grace, or benefit, asserted, either of infants, incapable of it, or of adults, who have already attained it, and are therefore brought to the font. In both cases, of infant and adult alike, the grace

or benefit of baptism is defined, "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." But in both cases this definition has to be qualified—in the case of infants by what infancy is capable of, and in the case of adults by what a converted adult still requires. These limitations confine the grace to a sealed pardon and adoption by the Holy Ghost, which both classes require and are capable of. On this understanding all may unite. Now we turn to the other sacrament. Here likewise comprehension is possible. We must assert with the Catechism that our souls are strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ then given to us; but we must qualify this presence by what is elsewhere said, that His Body and Blood are materially and locally in heaven alone, and present only in a way compatible with such confinement to one place at a time. We may think as highly as we can of the benefits of this beneficiary presence; we cannot think too highly, remembering only His words, "the flesh profiteth nothing," as by contact or touch; "it is the Spirit that quickeneth." We see no difficulty as to comprehension on, and within, these limits. We adore before we receive; but what? The Deity of the second person present; but not His material substance as a man, confined to heaven. We feed on His Body and Blood; but how? Consistently with their being present in heaven alone; the line must be drawn at His Body being now a natural Body, and having all that appertains to the perfection of man's nature. All that these lines exclude must be excluded. They are not our lines, but the lines of God and the Catholic Church from the beginning. It is very well to talk of oneness and unity, but there must be a limit between truth and falsehood. As well tell the Hollanders to break down their dykes and permit the ocean to flow in, and make of all one common abyss. Something has still to be said about Absolution and the Eucharist for the dead; but enough has been said for the present.

THE NEW ADMIRALTY PANIC.

IT is matter for regret that the Prime Minister has lately manifested some disposition to return to those Jingoistic views which had so large a share in expelling the Beaconsfield Cabinet from office. Since his own accession to the Government, as Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury had, until very recently, acted and spoken wisely in the direction of peace. But his remarks at Scarborough, and subsequently, have evinced an alarmist spirit, which furnishes cause for some anxiety to the nation. And further, he has alluded with approbation to the ridiculous performances of the Admiralty, along the British coast, last summer, as if some real importance was to be attached to the absurd statements put forth on that occasion, as to the imaginary

insecurity of the ports which were then alleged or supposed to be open to capture! It now appears that both the Admiralty authorities and the Cabinet are doing their utmost to frighten the country into squandering fresh millions upon naval blundering and waste.

Unfortunately, too, so many influential persons are interested in such expenditure that they are too successful in gulling a credulous public. The taxpayers need, everywhere, persistently to powder and to urge the question—What has become of the countless millions of money, already lavished so unsparingly, by Englishmen, time after time, in response to the demands of alarmist Statesmen and panic-mongering editors?

If Lord Salisbury and his Cabinet are specially anxious to strengthen the national defences, let them look into the corruption and extravagance which still characterise the great spending Departments. For instance, the very latest contest between British troops and the Arabs, at the battle before Suakim, on December 19th, 1888, revealed a disgraceful state of affairs. The chief London newspapers state that during the engagement "some of the sabres of the 20th Hussars played strange pranks, and complaints were frequent and bitter among our troopers. Three men report that their swords broke right in two when the fighting was hottest. Officers are complaining also of clogged revolvers." Why should Lord Salisbury ask British taxpayers to raise more millions for such results as these?

Reviews and Notices.

"A CHARGE BY JAMES MOORHOUSE, D.D., BISHOP OF MANCHESTER." John Heywood & Co., London and Manchester.

THE modern bishopric of Manchester has been fortunate in having, for its first occupants, three men of marked and powerful individuality, each highly gifted, but with gifts so widely differing, that it is not easy to compare, or even to contrast them, with each other. Oddly enough, they all have had the same name, and may be remembered by posterity as the Jacobean dynasty, James I., James II., and James III. First came a scholar of the highest order, a maker of other scholars, who will hold in the temple of Fame more conspicuous niches than his own, a trainer of true workmen like Lightfoot and Westcott, and, as may be appended *honoris causâ*, of a favourite of fortune like Benson; a man of great capacity, despotic temperament, and unflinching resolution; stern to others, but sterner to himself; respected and admired, though not tenderly beloved. Next followed the most beloved, because the most loveable of modern prelates; an able man for intellectual attainments, for business capacity, and for eloquence, but whose chief strength and weakness lay in the affections; whom a *besoin d'aimer* caused to acquire friends, and also to enlist favourites, and whom a *besoin d'être aimé* impelled to pursue popularity as keenly as even Mr. Gladstone; a sensitive man, who felt opposition as a personal slight,

and could never quite appreciate an individuality which asserted itself against his own; but withal so delicate, so tender, and so sincere that his memory is fondly cherished, even by those who may imagine him to have treated them unjustly. For the third member of the dynasty we must not anticipate the estimate which posterity will form at the final stocktaking, when business hours are done. Τέλος δείξει τὸν ἄνδρα. Possibly he may then be pronounced the strongest and ablest of the three, gifted with the clearest foresight, the firmest decision, and the most unshrinking courage.

We turned to his primary charge, in the hope that it would contain some word in season, suitable to this critical moment, when the question is unmistakably placed before the Church of England, whether or not it is to return to the mediæval idolatries, and especially to the worship of the Host. But on this subject the oracle is mute: and we fear that the practical conclusion of Bishop Moorhouse, as of Bishop Temple, is not to resist the prevailing tendency, and to let things slide.

The two first portions of the charge are employed on miscellaneous matters — cremation, which he evidently looks upon as a coming thing, and therefore explains how the Burial Service may be applied to it — gambling, the guilt of which he supposes to consist in the presence upon the mind of the desire to possess oneself of the property of another, without giving to that other any adequate value or service — half empty churches, which he believes to be caused by dull sermons, and by neglect of visiting, especially the last; and — general weakness of clerical influence, which he hopes to strengthen by more complete organisation of the parochial forces, by encouraging the clergy to furnish interesting instruction and innocent amusement, especially to the young of both sexes, and to qualify themselves, through the study of political economy under the guidance of Christian morality, to enter into those social questions which most interest the rising democracy.

The first subject treated at length is Religious Education. On this point his belief is, that its whole future depends upon the continued maintenance of the voluntary schools. He has no confidence in the religious tendencies of Boards elected by the democracy, and sees no safety except in keeping that department of education out of their hands. If this view is correct, the prospects of religion are bad; for the democracy is master, and into its hands education must eventually fall. But is it not possible for the Church and the democracy so to combine, that their action may become harmonious, and the clergy the chosen instruments of the sovereign Demos? What is it, let us ask, that keeps the two asunder? Is it not unreal dogmas which the clergy insist on inculcating? If the clergy only desired to teach the children to "fear God and keep His commandments," and to seek as the object of the whole message (παράγγελία) sent by God to man through Christ, "charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned" Demos would applaud and encourage them. The thing which produces the difference is the separate church or clerical interest — the sectarian interest in fact — which diverts into another and a lower channel much of the energy which ought to be expended on the pursuit of the good and happiness of the children. Remove the separate clerical object and suspicion will disappear.

The remainder of the charge can hardly be said to

deal with subjects of the day. The last three sections of it are occupied by a very able historical defence of the Reformation from the Anglican point of view. His lordship, although "exceeding broad" in all matters that relate to the criticism of the text of Scripture, is a very decided Episcopalian. "Consecration," he says, "the giving of spiritual mission, can only come from above, from that Episcopal order which has received its power of appointment through apostles;" yet he will not "decide that no ordination shall be regarded as valid which has not been conducted according to certain rules and forms of man's invention. That is, to make the grace of God dependent on the fancies of men, and the accidents of history." We fear he does not open the door quite wide enough to admit those who have been ordained by Presbyters only into the fellowship of the Christian Ministry. Could he not go one step further on the path of concession?

When so many positions have been surrendered, which once seemed necessary to the defence of the fortress — the Pentateuch — the narratives of Creation — even, to some extent, the Decalogue — is it well to remain so exceedingly tenacious about Episcopacy? About fifty years ago there was a young nobleman, now promoted to be a cabinet minister and a duke, who published a volume of very useful poems, which have all been forgotten except one couplet, which has proved immortal: —

"Let laws and learning, arts and commerce, die,
But leave us still our old nobility."

Mutatis mutandis, let Moses, David, Isaiah, fade away and disappear, but let us ever hold the magnificent truth, that none can possibly ordain except a bishop.

We have not noticed the third address, which is on the Sunday Question. It is the most original, and the most interesting; and contains, amongst its *obiter dicta*, those examples of daring criticism to which we have already alluded.

Altogether it is an able and interesting charge, but we hold that his Lordship ought to have spoken out on the question of the day. (Ezekiel xiii. 4, 5.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR, — It is easier to raise dust than to answer an argument. This is forcibly exemplified in the letter of "J. B." on the above subject in the PULPIT of the 20th inst. Instead of taking up my arguments advanced in previous letters, and replying to them *seriatim*, he fortifies himself behind the ramparts of Byron, Shelley, and Gladstone, and all the sceptics that have preceded our era; and then, after exhausting himself in a vain effort to sustain his case by such an unhallowed alliance, he calls aloud from Canonbury to Belfast to Mr. Murphy to haste to the fight, because his artillery has been silenced.

His sophistical letter is an artful fabrication of groundless assertions, skilfully intertwined to make the worst appear the better part. But "surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird."

In reply, I would like to ask him to be good enough not to put himself forward, either with respect to his

"impressions," "intelligence," or "kindly feelings," as a proof of the truth of his theory, or the falsity of ours; because, much as I would like to do it, I cannot accept it, and also to furnish me with a better test of the invalidity of our reasoning than his "inability" to see its force. It does seem strange that, before making this confession of his "inability," he did not suspect that there might be some defect in his organ of sight; some dimness of vision which rendered his seeing indistinct. I am the more anxious to draw his attention to this point, from the fact that the "faithful and true Witness" charged the Laodiceans with saying that they were rich, and increased with goods and had need of nothing, while at the same time they "*knew* not that they were wretched and miserable, and poor and *blind* and naked." They did not know their own blindness with all its concomitant miseries, though they thought they were all right, and that they saw all things clearly enough. To correct this pernicious habit of mind, He gave them the warning—most salutary at all times, to those who have the good sense, humility, and grace, to lay it to heart—to "anoint their eyes with eye salve, that they might see." I have been led into this train of reasoning from the fact that he says, "I do not *see* how any being gifted with intelligence and kindly sympathies could wish to pass an immortal existence, even in the condition which those holding his opinions call heaven," if our doctrine be true. Of course, when he wrote this, he meant that *he* was the "being gifted with intelligence and kindly sympathies"; because by the implication of the passage how could *we* who deny the doctrine of final restoration have any intelligence? Indeed, how could *we* have *any*, when *he* has the *whole* of it! how could we have any "kindly sympathies" when he has them *all*? Be it so for the present, then let us see how his "kindly sympathies" appear in the *morale* of the sentiment.

When he says that he could not wish to dwell in "what we call heaven," he implies that our heaven is *not* heaven, which, in substance, means that *we* shall not be *in* heaven. But how will this agree with his theory that we shall *all* be restored to heaven? I had thought that such a contradiction could not exist in *his* intelligence.

Suppose he don't mean that, then he must mean that, at least, there are *two* heavens; one for him and another for us, and that *his* is far better than ours. He would prefer, of course, to dwell in his own higher heaven, whence he could look down on us poor creatures, in our lower heaven, and say to us, "Stand by, for I am holier than thou." But I had thought that, on his theory of restoration, all evils—including Pharisaic pride and the absence of "kindly sympathies"—would be banished by subjecting us all to a "limited castigation," so that in the end we would all occupy the one heaven. Here he contradicts himself again. His theory, therefore, to say the least of it, has not brought consistency to his thoughts, and would be better given up, lest it involve him in still greater difficulties.

But still further, when he says that a being gifted with "intelligence and kindly sympathies" could not wish to dwell with us in our heaven, we naturally ask where is that great love which the advocates of restoration would fain have us believe dwells in them when they express such an ardent desire to save Adam's lost race. A person would have supposed that on his own principle he would have been prompted to put forth an effort to "restore" us to the

right heaven. His inconsistency again becomes apparent, when he expresses himself shocked at the idea of dwelling with people who put forth no effort to save the fallen; because could he not have fallen back for comfort on his principle *if he believed it to be true*, and say to himself, though these people neglect their duty, yet they will be made right in the end when they have been properly castigated? He gives us a hint, however, as to the reason of not being able to dwell with us, which is that we only "profess" to be wise and virtuous. But then why set himself up as a judge of our hearts? Is it not enough for him to set up the purgatory of a "limited castigation"? Must he also preside over our consciences? I would earnestly hope that the old Adam was not working in him when he penned this sentiment, and that he was not "moved with choler" against us, because we dared to traverse his doctrine. We dismiss this part of his letter with the remark that there is no connection between the truth of our doctrine and his inability to see certain consequences which may be supposed to flow from it.

We give a flat denial to the assertion that we take little account of the "moral consciousness." What we object to is men like "J. B." painting the moral consciousness of the Deity after their own image. We hold that the highest moral refinement is attained by bringing the consciousness into harmony with the revealed will of God; but "J. B." would reverse this procedure by making the revealed will square with the consciousness. His "sensibilities" rise up in rebellion against the notion of "everlasting punishment," and he thence concludes that such a thing cannot be. Apparently he has forgotten the statement made long ago that "the heart is deceitful above all things," and the awful example of one whom a "deceived heart turned aside that he could not deliver his own soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand." Our great aim is to awaken the consciousness from its sleep of spiritual death to repentance, and calling upon God for a present salvation, by announcing that "the wicked shall be turned into hell," and other salutary truths which we find written in the book; apprehending that it is better to warn people of their danger in time, than to let them sleep on until they wake up in "everlasting burnings." We do not like them to live in the delusion that they may sin with impunity now, and that they will afterwards get the guilt of it whipped out of them by a castigating rod in the world to come. We do not like to cry "Peace, peace, when there is no peace": but, by the grace of God, we wish to be faithful watchmen, by "giving warning of the danger when we see it coming."

In this rebellion of his "sensibilities" against revealed truth we see the reason of his dislike to dogma in which that truth is very often embodied; and his talk of the "mists and sophistry of Augustinian theology" and "misconceptions" of Scripture is only a *petitio principii*, as indeed is his whole letter. The charge of being "narrow-minded" is not levelled against us, but against Him who said "*narrow* is the way that leadeth unto life, and *few* there be that find it." Fear of taking up too much of your valuable space compels me to postpone an answer to Mr. Murphy until your next issue. R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, 24th July, 1889.

SIR,—Mr. Donaldson's letter on the Fatherhood of God, in the PULPIT of the 20th inst., demands a reply.

I do not say that the parable of the Prodigal is conclusive on the subject of a general restoration. Its scene is laid in the present world only. But the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God—which Mr. Spurgeon thinks a dangerous heresy—is most unequivocally taught by our Lord in that parable, and must be taken account of in considering the question of the final destiny of mankind.

Nor is there anything conclusive in Abraham addressing Dives as "Son." I shall speak further on the importance to be assigned to sayings which are not dogmatic.

As to Romans xi. 16, I seem to have failed to make my meaning clear. St. Paul there says, "If the root is holy, so are the branches." All, I believe, agree that the root means the Patriarchs, and the branches the people of Israel—a "flagrantly absurd idea if it were taken to mean that Caiaphas, Herod, and every other Israelite had attained to holiness—but true in the sense meant by St. Paul, who says further on (v. 26) that "all Israel shall be saved." Now, in whatever sense it is true that Israel is holy for the sake of the Patriarchs, it is, I think, self-evidently true, and certainly not absurd, that mankind is holy for the sake of the elect Church. I believe this is what St. Paul means by saying, also in v. 16, "If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump." Compare the saying of St. James, "Of His own will begat He us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures" (James i. 18). These sayings may not be conclusive as to a final restoration, but they at least suggest it strongly.

In my reference to "Noah, Daniel, and Job," I only quoted the words of Ezekiel xiv. 20: "Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in (that land), as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness." It is, I think, an uncontested fact, that God's gracious purposes to mankind are effected in the first place through elect individuals, of whom Abraham may be regarded as the type, and next through elect Churches. But if it were in all times and places true that such saints as Noah, Daniel, and Job could only hope to be saved alone, it is obvious that a Church could never have been formed.

Mr. Donaldson says I argue that "because all men are immortal, all men will be saved." I do not disavow this; but the way I prefer to express it is, that because God is love, all men will be saved.

I may have been sometimes wrong in offering assertion as proof. Few can quite escape the tendency to do so. But proof, in the proper sense of the word, is seldom attainable in moral and spiritual questions: "truth is something not to be proved, but to be seen."

Moreover, Mr. Donaldson certainly errs, in common with many others, in allowing no importance whatever to suggestion, and treating every argument as worthless which falls short of demonstration. Scripture is infinitely suggestive, and in studying the parables of our Lord especially, we should lose everything if we were not to attend to suggestions, for the strictly dogmatic teaching is generally, if not always, outside the parable. The parable is meant to illustrate, to enforce, and to suggest. And it is not honouring God to try to prevent faith from outrunning dogma. His written promises are to be trusted; but it is a strange way of honouring Him to say, as we say of some men, that He is to be trusted to the extent of His written promises, but no further.

As I have remarked, St. Paul says that "All Israel

shall be saved" (Romans xi. 26); and he says a little further on "God hath shut up all men unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all" (v. 32, Revised Version). This is one of many assertions of a universal restoration.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 24th July, 1889.

SIR,—I ask the favour of being allowed to make some brief comments on Mr. Sandland's confident assertions in the postscript of his letter appearing to-day:

(1.) "Man chooses to reject God's offer of mercy." True; but that is owing to defective and perverted faculties, for the correction of which ample means are provided in the Scheme of Redemption.

(2.) "We must accept God's plain teaching found in the Bible."

(3.) "Man may not substitute his opinions for God's word." Most true; "a Daniel come to judgment." One side can say that as well as the other.

(4.) Dogma must be the basis of faith, "whatever good and devoted (?) men may say."

My quotation was from Mr. Gladstone's paper in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1889. His words were: "In the circles of literature and science there is a strong anti-dogmatic leaning;" also "the instances of good and devoted men who are adverse to dogma are more frequent than usual in this age." The idea which I understand to be conveyed is, that the Augustinian theology put forth dogmas which inspire aversion among persons of intelligence and culture living in our age, even when they are good and devoted men. If dogma must be the basis of faith, and the dogmas presented by religious teachers are repugnant to the most intellectual men, it is not surprising if misty and vague notions prevail on the highest questions that can occupy human minds.

J. B.

Canonbury, 27th July, 1889.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SIR,—Mr. Joseph John Murphy asks me to explain what I said about the Evangelical party in our Synod joining the Broad, in expunging from the Athanasian Creed the necessity of "believing rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." I have all the divisions before me, and can substantiate what I say by quoting from them if required. The 24th verse, "Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is among the verses to be expunged, the Evangelical party assenting. I will not give the names of the eight assenting Bishops out of respect; and because I know one, at least afterwards repented, four, to their credit, refused. Of the clergy, one hundred and sixteen assented, only twenty-six objected; of the laity, one hundred and twenty-two for, only twenty-seven against. (See "Clerical and Lay Union." *Riding's*: Dublin, 1876, pp. 23 and xxix.)

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,

Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—How every individual voted is given in this Report. Anyone who knew them can class them as Broad or Evangelical.

Why, of all the twenty-six clergy and twenty-seven laity who fought for the truth in our Synods from 1871 to 1877, none else spoke out, is best known to

themselves ; and God is every man's judge. It is only about fifteen years ago — many, no doubt, have fallen asleep, but some must remain till this day. Alas ! they are silent, and allow a brother to be slandered as a false witness. But, as St. Paul says, "God stood by me though man shrank back."

ODIUM THEOLOGICUM.

SIR,—The personalities and invectives indulged in by a correspondent calling himself "Edmund Lawrence" in your last issue are, in my opinion, entirely uncalled for and most improper. I hear many persons say that they greatly value the contributions of the Very Rev. the Vicar-General of Kildare to your columns, otherwise known as "C.C., V-G." Although they cannot always go with him in his views and deductions, he is ever a fair and candid disputant, a courteous gentleman, and a ripe scholar, and he is never "offensive." May I ask was not Mr. "Edmund Lawrence" the writer who so persistently in your columns (not long since) denied the existence of the notorious Ritualistic Guild in Dublin University, saying that it was all a "myth." I would advise this gentleman (in the most friendly manner) to be cautious, and especially not to allude to "fabrications," and having said so much I shall now, with one word, take my leave of him : "Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones," *verbum sap.*

BARTHOLOMEW SPRING, LL.D.

EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION.

SIR,—A correspondent asks what this "new doctrine" or term, of which men speak nowadays, means. Allow me to say a few words. Our Lord having assumed our flesh of His Virgin Mother, it is pretended that, in the Eucharist, this material flesh is communicated, and so extended to us. It is a perfectly novel idea, and is opposed to our Lord's words, "the flesh profiteth nothing." That any one can be so insane as to imagine that our Lord's flesh can stretch down from Heaven to be joined to ours is almost incredible—sun, moon, and stars intervening, as Jeremy Taylor has it. Some men seem to say, "I believe because it is impossible." I cannot understand what "B" thinks on the matter ; but this is the plain meaning of this novel and absurd expression.

C. C., V-G.

THE Rev. Langford S. Brown has resigned the living of St. Petrox, Dartmouth, and is returning to South Africa to work under the Bishop of Pretoria.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury holds a Visitation of his diocese once in four years. The Visitation commences this autumn as follows :—Canterbury Cathedral, Tuesday and Wednesday, October 22nd and 23rd ; Ashford, October 23rd ; Maidstone, October 25th ; and Croydon, Saturday, October 26th. At each centre his Grace delivers a Charge, and in the afternoon entertains all the clergy, churchwardens, and sidesmen at luncheon.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE Oxford Diocesan Conference will be held on September 26th and 27th in the Sheldonian Theatre. The following notices of motion have been received and accepted by the standing committee :—

1. Mr. G. Herbert Morrell will move a resolution with reference to the New Code of the Education Department and its bearing on voluntary schools, especially in rural districts.

2. Mr. F. Wilder will move—"That it is desirable to establish in every diocese a body of pious laymen who may be invited to assist the clergy of any parish by the performance of divine service and preaching either in Churches or elsewhere, when and so long as licensed thereto by the Bishop."

3. Archdeacon Pott will move—"That the financial position of the Church societies in this diocese calls for the serious consideration of all classes of Churchmen within this diocese."

Notices received since the meeting of the standing committee :—

4. By the Rev. Henry Miller—"That parochial Missions, if well carried out, are of great value both in town and country parishes, and that therefore this conference is of opinion that it is desirable to appoint a diocesan Missioner for the diocese of Oxford."

5. By the Rev. Edward Marshall—"That the rules or standing orders affecting the proposing of independent motions be altered to the following effect :—That, instead of the fourth session as now, the third session of the conference be set apart for independent motions. That the mode of determining the priority of motions be assimilated to that of the House of Commons in such cases."

6. By the Rev. A. Carr—"That the systematic education of the higher classes in religious knowledge deserves the serious attention of the Church."

THE *Oxford Chronicle* publishes a statement which has been issued by Dr. Fairbairn in view of the opening of Mansfield College, Oxford, in October. It begins by referring to the distinctions gained by men studying at the college, four out of five being theological :—"This means not only that we have gained a full moiety of the highest honours in this field ; it means also that we have a body of zealous and capable students, known to the University, recognised by it, influencing through it the religious thought and life of England, making it impossible that our Churches can be reproached with deficiency of scholarship or indifference to sacred learning. To have weight in literature is to be influential with all living mind. Nor have our men simply achieved honour in the schools, they have showed devotion to the service of Christ and the Churches. We have two men in the Mission field ; a third, Mr. J. A. Robinson, M.A., has entered upon a work of rare difficulty and magnitude, the creation of a Free reformed yet national Church in Portugal. He loved the people of the land, for he was born there ; wished to serve and save them by preaching the Gospel of Christ ; believed that this could be done effectually only by Portuguese men working, independently of all foreign societies, among and for the Portuguese people. And so he went out from us in the spirit of the devotion that seeks obscurity that it may the better do service to gather Churches in the name of Christ." Of the purpose of the college, the Principal says :—"As regards religious activity our great sphere is the University. Here the field is immense, the opportunity awes by its very greatness. In Oxford 3,000 young men are gathered, seeking to be trained for the work of life. This army is ever being

recruited from the homes and schools of England, its front ranks are ever being dismissed into the varied services at home and abroad. And for the most part they remain what the University makes them. Hitherto the one religious influence has been Anglican—Oxford has generated the forces and formed the men that have worked the Anglican revival. Now the moment has come when the Free Churches are to attempt to prove their fitness to deal with the new sacerdotalism in the place of its birth, to cultivate a scholarship that will silence it, to evoke spiritual activities and qualities that will rebuke its pride and answer its claims. And this is to be attempted, not by methods polemical, but by reason, reasonable speech, seemingly living, and veracious teaching." Then mentioning the chapel, which, he says, is "considered beautiful even among the beautiful chapels of Oxford," he goes on to speak of the organisation of the work—"ambitious, not simply of educating our men in theology, but of penetrating the University with spiritual religion." It has been arranged that during the next academical year eminent preachers and leaders of the various Evangelical Churches in England, Wales, and Scotland shall occupy their pulpit, to which Dr. Fairbairn adds:—"We hope that thus over-against Anglican Uniformity we shall be able to exhibit the essential unity, the large comprehension, and the manifold beneficent activities of the Free Churches, engaged, even in the home of ancient learning and modern science, in the service of our abiding faith." The statement concludes with an appeal that the institution may be opened free of debt.

THE following are the subjects for the examinations in 1891, to be held at Cambridge on April 7th-10th, and October 10th-13th, in the preliminary examinations of candidates for holy orders:—1. A general paper on the contents of the Bible, with questions on "Introduction" in reference to the selected Books of the Old and New Testaments. 2. Old Testament: (a) Psalms, Book [I (1-41) [Candidates will be expected to be acquainted with the Bible and Prayer-book Psalters]; (b) Samuel. The paper in these books will contain questions on their subject-matter, criticism, and exegesis. An opportunity will be given for showing a knowledge of the Hebrew and Septuagint texts of the selected books of the Old Testament. 3. New Testament (in Greek): (a) the Gospel according to St. Matthew; (b) the Epistle to the Romans. The paper in these books will contain passages for translation and questions on the subject-matter, criticism, and exegesis of the books. Passages from the English Version will be given to be rendered into the original Greek. 4. The Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles: history, text, and subject-matter. Questions will also be set on Apologetics. 5. The Prayer-book: history and contents. 6. Ecclesiastical History: (a) the history of the Christian Church to the Council of Constantinople (inclusive); (b) the outlines of the history of the English Church, with special reference to the period 1509-1558. 7. Augustine, *De Fide et Symb.*, *De Symb.*, *ad Catech.*, and Leo, *Ep. ad Flav.* A passage will also be set for translation into English from some ecclesiastical Latin author not previously specified. 8. A voluntary paper on Elementary Hebrew, with passages for translation from 1 Sam. i.-iii.; xv.-xvii. Candidates are required to satisfy the examiners in each of the first seven subjects. A fee of twenty-five shillings will be charged to every candidate who enters the examination. Those who wish to offer themselves as candidates are requested to send their names, with certificates of moral character, and

particulars of their degrees, or written forms of nomination from Bishops in cases where such nominations are required, to the Rev. Dr. King, Madingley Vicarage, Cambridge, before 1st March for the Easter Examination, and before the 1st September for the October Examination. No text-books are recommended in any of the subjects. Candidates are desired to use the books recommended by the Bishop from whom they expect to receive ordination, and in other respects their attention is directed to "Outlines of Theological Study," compiled by the Committee of the Conference upon the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Aitken, Rev. James, M.A., Chaplain of the Memorial Church, Cannes.
 Bullock-Webster, Rev. F., M.A., Vicar of Stanway, Gloucestershire.
 Coates, Rev. A., Precentor of Rochester Cathedral; Vicar of Shorne, near Gravesend.
 Dickson, Rev. George G. W., Vicar of St. James-the-Less; Westminster; Vicar of King's Somborne, Hants.
 Easton, Rev. James George, M.A., Vicar of Ilketshall St. Margaret, Suffolk.
 Fraser, Rev. A. C., Curate of Bishopwearmouth; Vicar of St. John's, Bilton-with-Harrogate.
 Gorton, Rev. Charles Vincent, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Crewe; Rector of Poulton-le-Sands, Morecambe, Lancashire.
 Hall, Rev. Edward Vine, M.A., Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.
 Howell, Rev. Canon, B.D., Vicar of Wrexham; Archdeacon of Powys.
 Jackson, Rev. John Stuart, M.A., Rector of Weeting All Saints' and St. Mary's, Norfolk.
 Machell, Rev. Richard Beverley, M.A., Rector of Roos; Rural Dean of Hedon.
 Mallam, Rev. R. F., M.A., Vicar of Bloxham, Oxfordshire.
 Partridge, Rev. F., D.D., Rector of St. George's, Halifax, and Rural Dean; Canon of St. Luke's Cathedral, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
 Phipps, Rev. Pownoll William, M.A., Rector of St. Giles's, Chalfont; Rural Dean of Amersham.
 Pollard, Rev. George Cox, M.A., Rector of South Walsham St. Lawrence; Vicar of South Walsham, St. Mary, Norfolk.
 Richmond, Rev. Wilfrid John, M.A., formerly Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Chester.
 Robinson, Rev. Andrew Douglas Johnstone, B.A., Rector of Colby, Norfolk.
 Smith, Rev. David, B.B., Rector and Rural Dean of Sydney, C.B.; Archdeacon of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.
 Squires, Rev. Henry Charles, M.A., Church Missionary Society's Secretary, Bombay; Rector of St. Peter's-le-Bailey, Oxford.
 Stewart, Rev. Percy, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, West Derby, Liverpool.
 Taylor, Rev. Frederick, Rector of Burlingham St. Edmund-with-Lingwood, Norfolk.
 Thursby, Rev. Herbert Edward, Curate of Aberdare, Glamorganshire; Vicar of Tretower, Breconshire.
 Twining, Rev. W. H. G., Curate; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Westminster.
 Usher, Rev. Henry, Rector of Snitterby, Lincolnshire.
 Williamson, Rev. George C., Curate of St. James's, Holloway; Church Missionary Society's Association Secretary for S.W. District.
 Worthington, Rev. David, Rector of Llangeitho, Cardigan.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Biedermann, Rev. William Henry, late Chancellor and Rural Dean of the Diocese of Connor, and Rector of Ramoan, Ireland (formerly Vicar of Egham, Surrey), at Bournemouth, on the 29th ult.
 Fursdon, Rev. Edward, of Fursdon, on the 23rd ult., aged 78.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GRADUAL REVELATION OF THE LORD.

BY THE VERY REV. RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,
D.D., DEAN OF WINDSOR.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL ON
SUNDAY EVENING, JULY 28th, 1889.

"These things I have spoken unto you being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you."—ST. JOHN xiv. 25, 26.

HOW hard, how very hard it is to understand or to imagine what the human life of the Lord Jesus upon earth was really like! Never was there a time when so many people as now were trying to help us in the task. Historians re-picture the surroundings for us, and explorers probe the very soil of Judæan villages and Galilean hills, and the whole subject is again and again re-handled with quiet honesty and perseverance by all sorts of men, honest believers and equally honest unbelievers. And yet do we really know much more about it than our grandfathers did? I suppose we have all had a longing wish sometimes that we could see Him just for once as He was seen by the men and women who were then alive in Palestine, that we could judge of that life without all the haze which has of necessity gathered round it in the centuries. It cannot be. For good or evil we have lost the possibility of doing so. Try as we will we cannot stand where those men stood, and see Him as they saw Him. The very Gospel records which have taught us what we do know about that earthly ministry are the writings of men to whom the subject had already lost its first freshness. They had been teaching people about Him for years before they wrote down the records as we have them now. St. Luke tells us that he learned his facts from "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." "Ministers," teachers, that is, who had come to have a recognised body of reiterated teaching, perhaps even a form of words in which to tell it, before anything was written down about it all. The hand of God was on those men, the Spirit of God was breathed into them, that in the strength of that inspiration they should write those imperishable records in the very form which should make them potent for all lands and for all time. But they were records written years after the events had happened, and written for

believers. It may almost be said that they did not even attempt to convey in its first freshness the impress of the Lord's new and burning words. By the time the Evangelists wrote they already saw the facts of the Lord's life through the colouring glass of their own experience as teachers. They had learned, month by month, the power of the Message. They had come to group the facts and words of those years of ministry, and now they wrote them down, neither with the hot half-puzzled enthusiasm of the first days, nor with the cold calm accuracy of unconcerned or mechanical reporters, but with the forcefulness of men who had seen the doctrine proved by its fruits, and who knew in their own lives, and the lives of others, the abiding strength of the risen Lord about whom they spoke. Such a colouring then, if we must call it so, belonged to even the first records we possess of that unique human life. And with advancing centuries, and added generations of believers, and the varied experiences of Christian men and women, more and more new colouring has found its way into our picture of those eventful years, or rather—to express it otherwise—new features have been apprehended, new details have come to light, and the figure of the living Christ, as He stands before us now, is not quite the same figure which stood before the fisher-folk of Galilee, or the punctilious worshippers in the Temple of Jerusalem.

It is a matter of simple honesty, I think, to confess this both to ourselves and to others. And when we do, the critic exclaims in triumph, "You admit it then! You confess that accretions of modern or mediæval growth—or at all events of Church growth—have gathered round that grand and simple figure. You own that you no longer see Him as he really was. You admit that you are reading into the story the products of quite later days, and finding there not what the twelve Apostles and their followers really saw, but what you would like to think they saw or might have seen. The picture is your own, not the Evangelists."

The charge is common enough and important enough to be well worth our considering it. If the so-called "accretions," explanations, doctrines—call them what you will—are fanciful or unauthentic, if they are, in short, false additions to the true facts, then away with them. Cast them off, whether they belong to the first century of Apostolic work and wonder, or to the darker days of ignorance and misrule that followed, or to the sixteenth century's struggles and strivings after light, or to the more cool hard science of to-day. Once show the new notions to be fanciful and unreal, to be man's manufacture and not God's revelation, and then let them perish, as they must; or, at the best, let them take their place among the ingenious conjectures and guesses of believing men. But what, if instead of being man's gratuitous additions to the simple facts of the life of Jesus

Christ on earth, the thoughts which God allows to help us now be His fuller Revelation of that Life in all its power to meet the varying needs of men? What if this ampler understanding of what He was, be the direct fulfilment of the Lord Jesus Christ's own promise: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all the truth." Will guide you, bit by bit, that is, as the generations pass, into the completer understanding of a Life which belongs to no one race, to no one age. Each sort of people, each period of time, will contribute something to the whole: will find out instinctively—or rather by the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit—the truths which they need, the facts that help them, the application of Jesus Christ's Life and Death and Resurrection and abiding Life, to their own special character and necessities.

Stand by a lake-side in the moonlight, and you see a straight bar of light which flashes along the plashing wavelets towards the place where you are; and the friend, who stands a mile away from you along the same shore, sees a like bar flashing straight towards him. In truth the whole surface of the lake is thus illumined. But each can see only, or mainly, the light which, so to speak, extends towards himself across the ripples opposite his eye.

Not otherwise come the beams of light across the tossing years which bring the message of the Light of the World in separate lines of radiance towards the separate generations which in the darkness turn to Him. It is scarcely too much to say that Christ's Life and teaching could not otherwise be understood by us at all. It is a simple matter of fact, whether it pleases us or not, that our own reverent admiration of the Lord Jesus Christ, as He lived on earth, is based and built on something not quite the same as that on which the reverent admiration of the Apostles and Disciples was built, while He was yet going in and out among them.

Suppose we could to-night cast our eyes back—as we cannot now—to those Galileean days, and see Him just as He really was, should we certainly admire Him greatly? Surely, surely we should. And yet I think it would be on other grounds, for other reasons, than those which stirred the enthusiasm of his followers and friends in Capernaum, or Nain, or Bethany. All unconsciously we should admire that life on the strength of what has, so to speak, come to light about it since He went away. What was it that raised the glad acclaim, say in the procession upon the first Palm Sunday, or even upon the evening of Ascension Day, when the cloud had received Him out of their sight, and they returned to Jerusalem "with great joy?" It was something different from what mainly stirs us now. It was a reverent pride in his claims as their Messiah; it was a personal belief in his

high promises for themselves; it was a confident expectation of His immediate return in triumph as a conquering King to right the world's wrongs. And even a little later, when they began to understand Him better, their enthusiasm was still built up rather differently from our own. Their attitude was one of eager and immediate expectancy. It probably never even occurred to any of the earliest worshippers to regard this world, as it now is, as the field wherein Christianity should bloom. On the contrary, they looked on it as one looks upon a very aged man—beheld it as something about to die—with a future no doubt, but a future under new conditions altogether. The true advent had not yet come. This manifestation which they had seen had been, they thought, only a momentary flash to prepare the eye for a real and permanent coming. It was but the forerunner of an approaching glory. The Master was coming back again in reality, and then indeed all things would be made new. And the time was short. But a brief space and the change would come. Meantime fame, wealth, power, the refinement of art, the culture of education, these were in the lands of heathenism, and with heathenism they must perish. Let the disciple of the new kingdom stand apart. Let him separate himself even in thought from this world's vicissitudes. What were its joys, its sorrows, to him? His hopes were fixed on the immediate coming—it might be to-day: it must be soon—of a kingdom where glory would dim all worldly pleasure, and neutralise all worldly pain. Let him spend the brief interval in preparing for that stupendous and magnificent change which might at any moment be expected.*

Such, beyond question, was the view of those closest followers of the Lord in the first days after He had gone. A few years later they were themselves to come to look upon it differently. But this was how they first regarded it. And so long as that was their view, it is clear that there must have been whole regions of Christ's actual teaching which they had simply missed the meaning of. Soon they were to gain a knowledge of that meaning. Soon they were to realise its difference from what they had supposed. The truth was to come to them bit by bit as they stood face to face with the actualities of life, and felt the need, not of a future Messiah only, but of a present living Lord and Friend—helpful here and now in this world as it is—to the common needs of all sorts and conditions of men and women and little children. And as they found and felt that need, while He still delayed His coming back, they began to discover quite fresh meaning in His acts and words of love, and to find how true had been His promise: "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things

* For some of the foregoing thoughts, see Matheson's "Growth of the Spirit of Christianity," vol. i., p. 87, &c.

and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

My brothers and sisters, if in those earliest days the words so soon proved true, if the very men who had known Him face to face on earth could a few years later find in his life and teaching new meanings which they had not guessed before, may we not say that it is certain and inevitable, aye, and cheering and inspiring too, that for our own so different needs, in our own so different days, the Lord's message, the Lord's life must in like manner have ever new force according to the new and varying needs of our own time. That it should be so is involved in our very belief in the Holy Catholic Church, indwelt, inspired, instructed, guided, by the living spirit of our living Lord. "He shall take of mine and shall show it unto you."

Never, I suppose, in these eighteen changing centuries have there been so many intelligent men as now, whose lives are deliberately influenced by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Never was there so keen, and wide, and reverent a study of that holy life. And the study brings new thoughts to birth, thoughts appropriate to our time. Did it ever strike you that the enthusiasm about the personal character of our blessed Lord, as a force and an exemplar for ourselves, belongs peculiarly to our own day? It was an idea quite foreign to the men of old. The conscious admiration of personal character as such is the growth and outcome of a set of ideas which were unknown in those first days. The ideals, the patterns which men had then learned to care for, were outward beauty and courage and strength, whether mental or bodily. The world was a world for the strong. Victory, and the path towards victory, lay with them. A man's prowess gave the measure of his worth.

And all of a sudden, like the silver moon unveiled in calm radiance amid the rack of storm-tossed clouds, came the absolutely new Figure and Message: the Life which was to show men what to be rather than what to do, which was to teach them the power of self-sacrifice and the resistlessness of apparent weakness and defeat, when these are on the side of what is good and just and true. A few people, very few and very humble, began to see and grasp it, began to learn what is meant by character as apart from might, and the Christian ideal was born. It was born, and it grew, and it is growing still. Yes, amid discomfiture and failure and backsliding and wrong, it is growing. We are learning new things about His power; the power of that Divine life to mould the lives of nations, and of churches, and of separate men and women. The world's history, if we will only read it with the eyes of faith, is the best cordial for drooping courage. The clouds are often dark, and the waves run high, and the winds are contrary. But the Lord sitteth above the water-floods. The Master is with us in the ship. The kingdoms of this world

shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

Look afield at this moment. Two different centenaries of national life are being kept this year. Across the Atlantic, and across the English Channel, two great Republics are commemorating, each of them an event which occurred in its history just a hundred years ago. In each case it was a new departure in the nation's life—a fresh start under new auspices. But there the likeness ends. The one nation entered on its new path in direct and avowed allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ as its living King. The other nation in its wild reaction against misrule in Church and State shrieked against that faith with a defiant scorn. And the contrasted issues, as regards stability, and peace, and power, and promise, are surely voiceful in their lessons for us all.

Or turn to the personal needs of our separate lives, and the power of the living Christ to meet and satisfy them one by one. Jesus Christ, we have seen, taught us rather what to be than what to do. What He gave us were seeds, not crumbs. Seeds which will grow and blossom and bear fruit differently in different soils or under varying conditions of sunshine or cloud.

If the power to take the Lord's life as our pattern depended upon our doing great deeds and setting prominent examples, its practical help for most of us would be small. But, instead, He comes to us as we are; and He shows us how, in the utterly different conditions of our time, the principles which underlay His life can underlie our own; how, in the common round or the humblest working home, there is place for His example to tell, for His heaven to work, for His seed to spring and blossom and bear fruit in the daily trust in our Father; who is in heaven, in the quiet and simple courtesies which make home-life bright and strong and happy, in the priceless blessings of wedded love, in the reverent care for little children, in the common prayers and praises which raise us to a higher level of earnestness and thankfulness and hope. There lies for us the field of opportunity, the path wherein to follow in His steps, strong, ever stronger in the assurance that He has not left us unaided in one way, if we will but take Him at his word:

"The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

THE Ven. John W. Sheringham, Archdeacon of Gloucester, and Vicar of Standish, has been appointed a Canon in Gloucester Cathedral.

A DEPUTATION of Conservative members had an interview with Lord Salisbury on Wednesday, and presented a requisition signed by about ninety members, in favour of the abandonment of the Tithes Bill for the present Session. Lord Salisbury promised to consult his colleagues.

THE SONGS OF THE CHRISTIAN PILGRIM.

BY THE REV. BENJAMIN MATURIN, M.A.,
VICAR OF LYMINGTON.

SERMON PREACHED IN LYMINGTON CHURCH ON
SUNDAY MORNING, JULY 21ST, 1889.

"Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage."—PSALM cxix. 54.

THESE words, brethren, are the words of David, the "sweet singer of Israel." They are words addressed to God Himself. David is here not merely communing with his own soul, but he is speaking to God concerning the experience of his soul. He speaks of himself as a pilgrim upon earth; his residence here upon earth he viewed as the house of his pilgrimage, but through all the journey of life he set God before him. He felt that God was on his right hand, therefore he should not be moved. He had respect unto all God's commandments. They were his study all the day long. He remembered God's name in the night, and kept His law; yea, he could sing:—

Through all the changing scenes of life,
In trouble and in joy,
The praises of my God shall still
My heart and tongue employ.

And here, speaking to God Himself, he could say, "Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage." To lead you on to this happy frame of believing trust in God, permit me to set before you, first, the language in which David speaks of his residence upon earth, "the house of my pilgrimage"; second, how he cheered himself with song while on his pilgrimage. "Thy statutes," he says, "have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage."

I. David speaking of his house as the house of his pilgrimage may probably be speaking in reference to some particular *trials or sorrows* that afflicted his soul, and led him to look upon himself as a weary, way-worn pilgrim. His was, indeed, an eventful life; rising from the position of a shepherd to the rank of a warrior, from a warrior to a monarch, he had experience of bitter trials in all the changing scenes of his life. Now we find him as a musician in the court of Saul; now hunted like a partridge on the mountains, in straits and trials almost weary of life. Now we find him in bitterness of soul arising from the members of his household and family, mourning over the untimely death of Absalom his son, and exclaiming in the agony of his sorrow, "O Absalom, my son, my son; O Absalom, would God I had died for thee." Well could he say, "It was not an enemy that hath done this, for then, peradventure, I could have borne it; but it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends." In this, as in many other respects,

David appears to have been an eminent type of the Lord Jesus, who was denied and betrayed by His disciples. And, indeed, it is the lot of all God's children to meet with trials and sorrows in their passage through earth to heaven, "through much tribulation to enter the kingdom of God." Think it not strange, therefore, my brethren, if you are afflicted and tried in life. It has been the lot of many of God's saints of old. David, Job, Jeremiah, and many of whom the world was not worthy, passed through sorrow to joy unspeakable and full of glory. David, indeed, was a king, and his "house" was doubtless a palace, filled with such splendour as became the high position of the monarch of Israel; but after all, viewing himself in the light of his sorrows and spiritual trials, he speaks of himself as a pilgrim, his house as "the house of his pilgrimage." And whether he refers to the mansion in which he dwelt, or the world in which he lived, or the body in which his soul resided, he still felt that it was but an earthly house, of a tabernacle that must soon be dissolved, a hermitage for a pilgrim, a shell for a worm of the earth—"the house of his pilgrimage."

But perhaps David, in thus speaking of himself and his house, is not referring so much to any particular trial with which he was specially visited, as to the fact that he desired *at all times*, in joy as in sorrow, to look upon himself as a pilgrim and a stranger upon earth. St. Paul, speaking of the noble army of faithful worthies whose history he recounts in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, says of them that they confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on earth, and he observes that they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.

David, then, in speaking of himself as a pilgrim, desired to look upon himself as a stranger upon earth. And this, brethren, is the proper attitude of every Christian, to learn to look upon himself as a stranger upon earth, and to sit loose to its possessions. Riches are very ensnaring; high position and station are giddy heights for a Christian. The world with all its fascinations has a corrupting influence. A palace is a dangerous shell for a worm of the dust. David well knew this, and therefore he desired ever to look upon himself as a stranger upon earth, his palace as the house of his pilgrimage, and himself as a tenant at God's will. My brethren, it is well for us, amid all the ensnaring pursuits and corrupting influences of a prosperous station in life, to carry with us the feeling, "I am a stranger and a sojourner upon earth, as all my fathers were." But David, speaking of himself as a pilgrim, desired doubtless to look upon himself not only as a stranger upon earth, but as a sojourner or traveller pursuing his way through earth. Not settling down in the land, but passing through the land, and as such making progress from day to day. And such, my brethren, ought to be the Christian's life, an active life of onward

progress, pursuing the path of happy obedience to God in that station of life in which God has placed him, advancing from day to day, marking the milestones and leaving station after station behind him. Not standing still in his Christian course, or even idly gazing up into heaven, but, like Paul, "forgetting things behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, and so pressing toward the mark of the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus," marching through Emanuel's land to fairer worlds on high. As such, Christ must be his leader, the Spirit of God his light, the Word of God his guide, faith his staff, the world through which he passes a wilderness, the bread that came down from heaven his food, while he drinks of the living waters that gush from the smitten rock of Christ's side, and thus refreshes his weary soul "while passing on to God." Who has not read with deepest interest the allegory of the "Pilgrim's Progress," as sketched by the pen of the immortal Bunyan, in which we view the pilgrim pursuing his way from the City of Destruction to the Hill of Zion, now escaping from pursuing peril, now falling into the Slough of Despond, now surmounting the Hill of Difficulty, passing the den of lions, or shuddering in the cage of Despair; resting in the arbour, or conversing with Evangelist; but in all and through all one principle pervading his path—Progress, progress; if falling asleep in the arbour and losing his roll, paying the penalty of his indolence, and still with redoubled energy pursuing his way. So, my brethren, the Christian pilgrim must be "not slothful in business but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." He must "add to his faith, virtue, and to virtue spiritual knowledge, and so be neither barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." His marching orders must ever be "forward, onward, upward," looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. Keeping ever in view "the city which hath foundations, whose Maker and Builder is God"; and anticipating the time when "an abundant entrance shall be ministered unto you into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

II. And now, brethren, turning from the consideration of David in the house of his pilgrimage, let us see how he occupied himself as a pilgrim by the way. "Thy statutes," he says, "have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage." And here, brethren, I would observe that David, though a pilgrim, *had his songs by the way*. God graciously permits, yea, encourages his people to break the loneliness of the weary way by songs that cheer the spirit. He gives to his people songs in the night. Religion is not, as some say, all gloom and sadness; it has, indeed, its nights, but there is no night so dark in the Christian's course in which the star of Bethlehem, if looked for, will not shed its light through the gloom. The Christian, indeed, may be as sorrowful yet alway rejoicing, as having

nothing yet possessing all things. He has a source of joy with which the world is unacquainted, a legacy of peace from Christ his Saviour, a well of water within him springing up into everlasting life, while the peace of God which passeth all understanding flows like a gladdening river of joy into his soul, filling at times with joy unspeakable and full of glory. And so as pilgrims on their journey, as soldiers on the march, or the ploughman at his labour, cheer their spirit with song, so the Christian pilgrim has his songs with which he cheers his spirit by the way. David had songs in the night, songs in the house of his pilgrimage. Solomon's songs, we are told, were a thousand and three. Our Lord Himself, on the night of His betrayal, sang an hymn with His disciples. Paul and Silas in prison sang praises unto God; and Paul says, "Is any merry, let him sing psalms." Luther, we are told, when hearing of any disheartening intelligence, was in the habit of saying: "Come, my friends, let us sing the 46th Psalm, 'God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.'" Cultivate, my brethren, this spirit of sacred song; it will often tend to cheer your drooping spirits, or give expression to the gladness of your hearts. Cultivate it in your family circles. It will elevate, ennoble, and refine the mind, and often be the means of uniting a family circle in the glad accents of praise to God. And even where the voice or want of musical power will not permit the active exercise of song, the Christian can still sing and make melody in his heart unto the Lord. Cultivate, my brethren, the spirit of sacred song in the assemblies of God's worshipping people; join in the services of the sanctuary; consecrate heart and voice to the honour of God; take your part in singing His praises; learn at least to lisp the praises of God here upon earth; so may you hope to join in the song of the general assembly of the first-born which are written in heaven. How blessed it is to see a whole assembly united in singing the praises of God, lifting up their voices and singing for the majesty of the Lord:—

At once they sing,
At once they pray;
They hear of heaven,
And learn the way.

This is indeed blessed, but how glorious to listen to the strains of heaven's music, to listen with the beloved Apostle to the song of God's glorified people, where he says: "I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." My brethren, do you hope to join hereafter in this glorious song of praise? You will assuredly bear a part in it if you have "washed your robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb"; "for these are they who come out of great tribulation, stand in the presence

of God and the Lamb, and shall sing His praises for ever and ever."

But now returning from the contemplation of the song of God's glorified people in heaven, let us mark the *subject matter* of David's songs in the house of his pilgrimage. He tells us himself what his songs were. "Thy statutes," he says, "have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage." By which he means the Word of God, with all its blessed precepts and promises and glorious prophecies; the Word of God, which he says is perfect, converting the soul, making wise the simple, and rejoicing the heart; the Word of God, more to be desired than gold, yea, than much fine gold, which he says was sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, and in keeping of which there was great reward; the Word of God, which he calls God's "statutes," had been his songs in the house of his pilgrimage. And no better songs can cheer the heart of the Christian pilgrim during the days of his sojourn here upon earth than the songs of God's statutes, sung of old by the psalmist of Israel; for the Christian needs songs to *cheer* and *comfort* him during the trials and difficulties of his earthly pilgrimage; and where are there songs so full of comfort as the songs of Zion? The statutes of God are indeed well suited to cheer and comfort the Christian. They set before him the wonderful love of God in Christ Jesus. They tell of the covenant of God well ordered in all things and sure. Here he may sing of the mercy of the Lord, which is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear Him. Here he reads the story of redeeming love in the sufferings and death of Christ Jesus for him. When sin rises, when conscience accuses and guilty fears intrude, he is assured that "the blood of Jesus cleanses from all sin." Here he reads of the sweet influences of the Holy Spirit of God, who enlightens, sanctifies, and comforts God's believing people. Here he has the records of God's way and works of old in His dealings with His people. He traces them in the history of their sorrows and wanderings, their joys and comforts. He converses in spirit with Enoch and Abraham, David, Daniel, Job, and Jeremiah; with Peter and Paul. He is with John in Patmos, and catches glimpses of the glorious scenes that passed in vision before his enraptured gaze; and thus sees illustrated in their lives the truth of Scripture, that "all things work together for good to them that love God." He is cheered and comforted, and goes on his way rejoicing. As a pilgrim he needs *light*, for the night is oftentimes dark, but God's Word is a light to his feet and a lantern to his paths; a chart, a map, a compass, it guides his wandering feet to tread the heavenly road. While nearing the city of God, voices are heard from on high encouraging his soul: "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord. They rest from their labours, and their works do follow them." The music of heaven

now breaks upon his ear, the lights of the glorious city are seen, he walks in spirit its golden streets, and thus is cheered, comforted, and refreshed while singing the songs of Zion. Happy is the man, then, who can say with David: "Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage," for he knows that though heaviness may endure for a night, yet joy cometh in the morning, in the morning of the Resurrection, when "the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, when they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and mourning shall flee away."

Cultivate, my brethren, a growing acquaintance with the Word of God. Store its memorable passages and precious promises in your memories. Talk of them when you walk by the way, when you lie down and rise up. Speak to yourselves in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. So shall your pilgrimage through life be cheered by the comforts of God's blessed Word, till done with sin and sorrow you join the chorus of God's redeemed people in their glorious song of praise, "Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

CHRISTIAN DUTIES IN PERILOUS TIMES.

No. I.—PERILOUS TIMES.

BY THE REV. E. A. COOKE, VICAR OF ATTLEBOROUGH, NUNEATON; AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE OF S. COLUMBA."

COURSE OF SIX SERMONS PREACHED DURING LENT, 1889, AT ATTLEBOROUGH.

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come."—2 TIM. iii. 1.

THE subject on which I hope to address you during this season of Lent is this: "Christian duties in perilous times," and I have chosen these words of St. Paul to Timothy as affording a fit introduction to the following course of lectures. Whilst the subject is one which is always important and deserving our attention, there is very much at the present time that is exceptional, and the words of our text have more than an ordinary significance which few can fail to recognise. The quick succession of events and the aspect of our present surroundings are a source of alarm and uneasiness to many hearts, and therefore there are loud and peculiar calls upon our self-devotion and self-sacrifice, such as Timothy was exhorted to exercise for the sake of Christ. After accompanying St. Paul in many of his travels and labours in preaching the Gospel, Timothy, his disciple, his "dearly beloved son in the faith," is said to have been ap-

pointed and ordained by him as the chief minister, or bishop, of the Church of Ephesus.

In this capacity the words of the text were primarily addressed for the purpose of exhorting him to constancy and watchfulness in his office; and, as history tells us, they were not addressed in vain, for, after spending his life in the work of the ministry, he at last sealed by the death of a martyr his testimony to the truth, thus proving himself to have been not only as S. Chrysostom describes him, "a person of rare endowments," but a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

Having alluded to some who had deserted him in his hour of trial (from whom Timothy should resolutely turn away), and predicting a great development of evil in the future, St. Paul urges upon him the necessity for a meek yet bold and faithful discharge of those various duties of his office, holding himself prepared for opposition and suffering.

Now, the words "last days," which occur in our text is a phrase we frequently meet with in the Scriptures, but in no case does it imply that the world was soon coming to an end, but refers to the last days of Christ's Church, the latest period of the final dispensation under which the affairs of the world will be wound up. God alone knows (St. Matt. xxiv. 36) when that time will come, but whether it will be a very long period or a very short one, it will certainly be the last one. Whilst the day or the hour are not revealed to us we may infer the nearness of that time from the signs and tokens which are constantly taking place; nor shall these revelations be invalidated by any future one, for the Lord Himself has declared, "He that rejecteth Me and receiveth not My words hath One that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day" (St. John xii. 48).

That the Christian dispensation was regarded by St. Paul and the other apostles as the end to which all the former periods worked up, is very evident. The "last days" include the whole New Testament age, from the first coming of Christ to His second. On the day of Pentecost St. Peter quotes the promise spoken by the prophet Joel, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams," etc., and then gives the solemn warning which follows the promise, namely, that the "last days" are to be followed by "the great and notable day of the Lord." And the same Apostle, who had himself endured many trials, comforts the weak and tempted Christians, and bids them not to fear, though the "end of all things was at hand," but to be "sober and watch unto prayer" (1 Peter iv. 7). St. John (1 Epis. ii. 8) writes in the same strain, "Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that anti-

christ shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time."

And in the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 1), the writer tells them that God in many parts (*πολυμέρως*) and in many ways (*πολυτρόπως*) made important revelations in "time past," that is, from the origin of the human race to the days of Malachi—a period of more than three thousand five hundred years—but "hath in these last days" given greater evidence of His love in the person of His dear Son. We thus see that the period termed by the Jews "the last days" were the days of the Messiah, and that His second coming was the daily expectation of the primitive Church.

But what was there, it may be inquired, that justified the apostles to regard the Christian dispensation as the "end of all things"? To answer this question we must consider the term "last days" in connection with many of the prophecies of the Old Testament, for there we obtain in a comprehensive form what may be regarded as a great scheme of prophetic truth during the time of the Gentiles. The various revelations made in past times, whether by history, prophecy, poetry or proverbs, clearly described the days of the Messiah by this title, and which ever afterwards became associated in the minds of Christians. In Deut. iv. 30, 31, we read, "When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, even in the *latter days*, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient unto His voice, He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers, which He swore unto them."

In Micah iv. 1, 2, we have one of the most comprehensive predictions to be found in the Old Testament, foretelling the establishment of the Christian Church subsequent to the passing away of the Mosaic period, and which, as yet but partially fulfilled, will not have its full and final accomplishment till the consummation of all things. "But in the *last days* it shall come to pass that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and the people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." It is a beautiful picture of the Gospel Church of the future, which shall be firmly established and well built upon a rock "on the top of the mountain," whose builder and maker will be Christ Himself, and who will say, when the great Church from heaven shall come silent and alone, not "on this rock I will build," but "on this rock *I have* built my Church." And in Jeremiah xxiii. 20 the prophet warns the people about the false prophets, against whom a grievous whirl-

wind of the Lord was to go forth and fall upon them. "The anger of the Lord," he says, "shall not return until He have executed, and till He have performed the thoughts of His heart; *in the latter days* ye shall consider it perfectly," that is, at the time appointed their sins shall be brought to light, and they will then understand the punishment that shall suddenly overwhelm them.

Surely, my brethren, if the apostles had full belief in the truths taught by the prophets, and that Christ's second coming was the daily expectation of the Primitive Church, how much nearer must it be now after eighteen hundred years! As the Old Testament saints, to whom God's will was marvellously communicated, waited for the first coming of Christ, even so are we for His second coming. While we are waiting and hoping for those last days when Christ shall appear in all His majesty, let us hasten the time by diligent prayer, 'holding fast the confession of our hope (*κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος*) without wavering, considering one another to provoke unto love and to good works, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more, *as we see the day approaching*' (Heb. x. 23).

The connective "for" in the verse following our text is suggestive, as showing the nature of the dangerous errors of the *last days*. Men were to be selfish, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemous, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, without natural affection, ruthless, calumnious, incontinent, merciless, haters of the good, treacherous, headlong with passion (*προπετεῖς*), high-minded, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having an outward form of Godliness, but renouncing the power. From such Timothy was to turn away, but was to see in them the germs of evil of which a greater development would take place in the future.

However much men may differ in opinion as to the particular period of the world's history to which we have arrived, we must all, I think, admit that the present times are perilous, and never has there been at any past period such an accumulation of foretokens of a perverse anti-Christian temper, showing itself in quarters we might have little expected. We need no clearer proof of this than the spirit of lawlessness and resistance to all divine and human authority, the deification of humanity taught by the philosophy of the age, the bold attacks made upon the foundations of the Christian faith, the too evident tendency in the direction of materialism, the unexampled restlessness and rapid change in the religious, social, and political worlds. Men are now saying (as in the apostles' time), Where is the promise of His coming? Others, not satisfied with the results of Christianity, are saying it is a worn-out and effete thing, and some are seeking for treasures in the dust-heaps of old superstitions. We have not yet outlived the age

of Balaams with tongues of eloquence, but with deceitful and covetous hearts, or of Judases with almost miraculous powers, but with traitorous design. Now, as in all ages, there are those of whom the Lord might say, as He did of the false prophets in the days of Jeremiah, "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied."

My brethren, with such an aspect before us our path seems difficult; nevertheless, as Christians, our way is clear, namely, to have firm faith in Christ's first coming, and a cheerful hope of His second coming. This is the secret of a holy and useful life. The irreligion, the sin, the grievous disloyalty of others, is the very reason we should be faithful to God. If our religion were real, though we stood alone like Daniel, it might still be said of us, in the striking expressions of Milton, "Faithful found among the faithless, faithful only he: Among innumerable false, unmoved, unshaken, unseduced, unterrified, his loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal. Nor number, nor example, with him wrought to swerve from truth, or change his constant mind, though single." True Christians may be taunted with being a minority, but it matters not if we are a *loyal* minority, loyal to God, loyal to ourselves. There were minorities in the ancient Church of God, in the ark with Noah, with Elijah in the days of Ahab, and with St. Paul in the upper chamber of Jerusalem. Yes, few are better than many, if they be like Gideon's picked three hundred, who were more effectual against the Midianites than the original twenty and two thousand that went up with him. Few are better than many if we are faithful to Christ, holding fast to Him in quiet dependence on His unfailing promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

THE *Indian Churchman* states that the Rev. G. A. Lefroy, of the Cambridge Mission to Delhi, has felt himself compelled to refuse the new bishopric of Chota Nagpur, which, at the suggestion of the Church Council, was offered to him by the Metropolitan.

THE *Record* is enabled to announce that the bishopric of Sydney has been definitely offered to the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and as definitely declined. "The rumours freely circulated as to the intentions of Canon Saumarez Smith and the Rev. F. J. Chavasse are, we believe, wholly without foundation."

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners on Thursday week considered the recommendation of the committee nominated by the Bishop of Wakefield to select a house for the see. This committee, by a majority of votes, recommended the purchase of Hall Croft, near Mirfield. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, however, considered that a house should be provided in the immediate neighbourhood of Wakefield. As this will probably involve selecting a site and building, the Bishop has arranged for the present to rent a house in Thornhill parish from next Michaelmas, the address being Overthorpe, Thornhill, Dewsbury.

PAMPHLET
and Advice
FREE

Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to
MR. C. B. HARNESSES,
Consulting Medical Electrician. (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians),
 for his New Medical Work, entitled
"Harnesse's Guide to Health,"
 which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harnesse's Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.
MR. C. B. HARNESSES also gives Advice (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 10, 1889.

BRIDE AND BRIDEGROOM.

THE Royal Wedding is now an accomplished fact. So much has been written about this auspicious event by the newspapers during the past fortnight that little remains for us to say upon it. Nevertheless, each one can make his own comments, and we may be allowed to add ours to the list. This marriage follows the precedent established by the bride's aunt, after whom she is named—Louise, Marchioness of Lorne—who, herself of Royal blood, became the consort of one of Her Majesty's subjects. Is this a wise or an unwise step to take? Is it a concession to the Radical spirit and the budding Republicans who so blindly seek to destroy all class distinctions, and to nip Royalty in the bud? Most decidedly not. On the contrary, it is a means of rendering more secure the true position and extending the legitimate influence of the Queen's descendants. We may be thankful that the days of the Heptarchy are gone by. There is no longer in this land of ours a horde of petty princes keeping up their sham courts by terrorism and rapine, regardless alike of private rights and of the inherent weakness of a disintegrated country. The result of such a subdivision in modern times may be seen on the Continent, where the international jealousies of petty States are a constant source of disturbance, and it is surely a false Conservatism that would keep the Royal Family of England tied and fettered by the corroding chains of caste such as still exists in India. To compel the younger branches of our own Royal tree to seek for spouses abroad, is to assume that the insignificant descendants of foreign sovereigns are more to be desired than the scions of our old nobility, and the

most distinguished of our fellow countrymen. The words of Lord Bacon on this subject are worth recalling on the present occasion. He says: "In reference to nobility as an institution, it is important to remark how great a difference it makes whether the order of nobles shall include—as in Germany and most other countries—all the descendants of noble families, or as in ours, only the eldest, the rest sinking down into commoners. The former system is very bad, dividing society into distinct castes, almost like those of the Hindus. Our system, through the numerous younger branches of noble families, *shades off*, as it were; the distinction between noble and not-noble, and keeps up the continuity of the whole frame." And if this apply to the nobility, it is equally applicable to the Royal Family itself. It is only right that the heir apparent should marry a king's daughter. We can point with loyal pride to the Princess of Wales, and say that the country will be more than contented if her first-born son makes choice of another such woman as she for his bride, and we feel that the intermarriage of the reigning families in different countries cements their unity and helps to promote peace. At the same time, the marriage of our princesses with the representatives of our noble houses draws the ruler closer to the subject, and the citizen feels that there is a new and honourable link between himself and his sovereign. It is a source of congratulation that the Royal parents have passed their own silver wedding day before they are called upon to give away their eldest daughter, and thus for the first time experience the severance of that family circle into which the grim hand of death has never yet been able to effect an entrance. Our venerable contemporary, the *Times*, indulged in a pathetic soliloquy on the marriage morn itself which might well have furnished ample material for a sermon for the following day. It spoke quite touchingly of the first marriage in a family as sounding the knell of the parent's departing youth—a sad reminder, but withal an honourable one. On the other hand, the presence of Mr. Gladstone, coming fresh from his own golden anniversary to the Royal nuptials, reversed the picture by suggesting an augury of good health and long life to the newly-wedded pair. We can hardly expect that the noble bridegroom of to-day will be as well and hearty in the year 1939 as Mr. Gladstone is now, considering the difference in age at their respective espousals; but the Scotch are a hardy and long-lived race, and we may not unreasonably hope that he too may live to enjoy his year of Jubilee, with his grandchildren at his knee.

—♦—

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE CARDIFF CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE programme which has been mapped out for the Cardiff Church Congress seems to be as good a one as that adopted last year at Manchester. The speakers selected are amongst the most leading Churchmen of the day, and whilst the selection of speakers has been of an impartial and exhaustive nature, there is not the exclusively "broad" element which tended from its ubiquitous character to cast a cloud over the gathering in October last. Though there is no such fortunate coincidence as a Pan-Anglican Synod this year, we venture to believe that the Bishops of our Church will be represented both in quality and quantity. Of course the great subjects for the consideration of the Congress will be the Church in Wales, Church and State, and some of the many subdivisions of Secularism which were the prominent features of the Manchester Church Congress. With regard to the Church in Wales we must congratulate the Committee on their excellent selection of speakers, and those who have any acquaintance with the Welsh character cannot but feel that there must be much good resulting from the stimulus which such a discussion will give to our Welsh brethren. In reference, however, to the subject of Church and State we do not feel so sanguine, and we are bold to prophecy that the result of the Congress in this respect will be rather a tendency to favour the dissolution than to retard it, especially when it becomes more generally known how disastrous such a course must prove to the various nonconforming bodies, and in this matter we should have been glad had the Committee followed the example adopted by the Wolverhampton Church Congress in inviting one or two of the more prominent leaders of Nonconformity to give us the benefit of their opinions. With regard to the third prominent subject we cannot but feel a tinge of sadness to see how slowly, but surely, the true Christian duty of the *due* performance of the daily routine of life and the spirit of rampant Agnosticism are being bound together in the eyes of the thinking world. The discussion even of these questions has led to much evil; men's words are misinterpreted, and the man of the world finds himself, or thinks he does, face to face with a considerable portion of the Church teaching just what he wants to believe, but which his inner consciousness refuses to accept. We are often painfully brought face to face with men who deduce from Mr. Wilson's remarks on the Bible, that the word of God is not true, and we cannot but wish that either such questions as affect the very foundations of our Christian verity should only be placed in the hands of men of whom it might be said that "they had been with Christ," or that a very much more devotional tone should be given to the whole business of the Congress.

We are glad that the meetings are commenced with prayer, but we wish that there were a more devotional spirit pervading the subsequent deliberations. Perhaps the Cardiff Congress will make a move in this direction.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." August, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS is one of the exceptionally good numbers of the "Expositor"; except Canon Cheyne's gushing article on Psalm viii., every paper is excellent.

Mr. Rendall concludes his remarks on St. Paul and the Galatian Judaizers, by a series of notes on the leading passages in the epistle. In fact these two articles—last month's and this—would form a most excellent introduction to the epistle. Once we think Mr. Rendall is too fanciful. He would amend vi. 3 by reading *μηδὲν ὄν* instead of *μηδὲν ὄν*, and translating "For if a man thinks there is something amiss when there is nothing, he deludes himself." But there is no authority for the emendation, and if the Authorised Version is "no better than a truism, with little point in connection with the context," surely the same may be said of his own suggested emendation and translation.

The article by the late Mr. W. H. Simcox on the Prodigal and his Brother is one of the best sermons on the parable we have ever read. There is a keen insight into character in many of the remarks, very different from the truisms and commonplaces with which readers of commentaries and hearers of sermons are too often treated. We had marked many striking passages, but find that all are too long for extracts, and can only send our readers to the article itself.

Mr. J. J. Murphy has a very suggestive article on Unprofitable Servants. His remarks on the seemingly harsh words, "after that thou shalt eat and drink" are very good. And so is this sentence, "And lest the importance of the position and the responsibilities of His servants should not be esteemed highly enough, Christ has added the very remarkable incident, that of the three servants concerning whom He relates the account of their stewardship, and the consequent judgment upon them, the wicked and slothful servant was that one to whom the least had been entrusted; signifying that one of the chief dangers to be guarded against is the tendency to underrate the importance of our stewardship; to think it not worth while to make the most of comparatively small endowments and small opportunities. Arnold of Rugby, who had a right to speak on such a subject, says in a letter to one of his old pupils, 'I am satisfied that a neglected intellect is far oftener the cause of mischief to a man, than a perverted or overvalued one.'" Professor Stokes continues his article on S. Columbanus, and Professor Bruce continues his exposition of the epistle to the Hebrews; but we have not space to do more than merely mention either. The whole number, as we said before, is exceptionally good.

"THOMAS BECKET, MARTYR PATRIOT." By Thomas Anchor Thompson, M.A. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1889.

MR. GLADSTONE has set us all on studying history. Here we have a most interesting and original book.

It gives us a new view of Becket's character, well supported by original letters of the period. He appears, not as a saint, but as an agitator for freedom. He was anything but an ascetic. His quarrel with Henry II. was for the rights of the laity against Norman tyranny. His appeal to Rome was merely because there was no higher power to appeal to. He wrote to Pope and Cardinals letters, "the most severe, perhaps, that ever were addressed to them by one in their obedience" (page 261). We have all the materials for judging of Becket's character as a champion for liberty. We have also materials for judging Henry II. He seems to have been an embodiment of all vices. In his passions he was a very wild beast, tearing people's eyes out with his own hands, and sparing neither age nor sex. Mrs. Green's "Henry II." may well be read, as giving another view of the King; as also Lord Littleton's "Old History," and Bishop Stubb's "Modern Labours." The words of contemporaries are given, so that Becket stands before us a living, speaking character. The book has all the interest of a romance, and does Mr. R. A. Thompson infinite credit.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—In Mr. Murphy's letter to the PULPIT of the 20th inst. we find the following statement: "Heaven and hell are not opposed to each other in Scriptural language (I am now speaking only of the use of words)." When he wrote *Scriptural* language he meant *Scripture* language; and when he said "I am now speaking only of the use of words," I am afraid he did not properly know what he was speaking about. We can regard words as sounds, or as objects of sight, or as signs with a definite meaning. This last is the only proper use of words. To use words without a meaning is to cause a jargon. When he says that heaven and hell are not opposed when used only as words, he implies that they are opposed in some other way; and the only other way in which they can be opposed is in their meaning; that is to say, that there is a hell, and that there is a heaven. This is precisely our own notion, and is in accordance with Scripture, where we read, "And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment"; or, as the original has it, in "Hades he lifted up his eyes"; evidently giving us to know that our translators gave the name of hell to the place of torment in Hades. This then is one of the divisions of the universe. And when our Saviour prayed, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," he mentioned the other two. What then becomes of his assertion that "the modern (is it modern?) division of the universe into heaven, earth, and hell, does not occur anywhere in Scripture"? With an inconsistency which is truly marvellous he admits the existence of this hell in the very next sentence, wherein he says that the "things under the earth, in Phil. ii. 10," refers not to *Gehenna*, the place of punishment, but Hades, the abode of the dead. It must, therefore, be in opposition to the "things in heaven," and consequently the usual trichotomy of the universe must stand. Besides, if, as he says, "heaven and earth means the entire universe," why mention the "things

under the earth"? St. Paul is quite consistent with himself in using this three-fold division, when speaking of the all-creating power of Christ in Col. i. 16, the things "invisible" including the *Gehenna* of Hades. But when speaking of gathering together the "all things in Christ," in Ephes. i. 10, he uses a different formula, leaving out the *third* division, and using only the first two—the heaven and earth, plainly intimating that the "gathering" did not extend to *Gehenna*. Mr. Murphy makes another mistake in supposing that the "all things" in this passage (Ephes. i. 10), are to be taken *absolutely*. This cannot be, for it would then include the devil! But it is to be taken as the "all things in Christ; the ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ being *limitative* and *qualitative* of the τὰ πάντα. To be "in Christ" is a frequent phrase with St. Paul to denote those who have been saved by faith in Him.

To say that "heaven and hell are not opposed in Scripture language" does not agree very well with "And thou Capernaum which art *exalted* to heaven shall be brought *down* to hell."

Let us take another sentence. He says, "We know that Christ will yet subject all things unto Himself, and St. Paul here teaches that He will do so, not as a mere Conqueror, not by mere omnipotence, but in the same way in which He will in the Resurrection make the mortal body of our humiliation to be like the body of His glory."

"In the same way"; in what way is that? Not by mere omnipotence? By what power then will it be done? Will He lay aside His omnipotence when He performs this work? "Mere omnipotence" implies that there is something better than omnipotence. And what is better than the omnipotence of Him "who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will"?

When our Saviour commanded the Apostles "to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," saying, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not *shall be damned*"; He explained what He meant by "drawing all men unto Him," instrumentally by His Gospel and meritoriously by His death. There is salvation for all, *if they believe*, but all do not believe; some resist the "drawing" through unbelief, and so perish.

There is no universal ultimate salvation in this language.

We read of the "blood of Christ cleansing us from all sin," and "purging our conscience from dead work," but we never read of fire by itself purging our sins. It is as unphilosophical as unscriptural to represent a material agency working a moral renovation in a spiritual subject. This is always represented in Scripture as being done immediately by the power of God. "It is God that worketh in you."

"God is love." Certainly, but only through Christ, and there is no Christ for the lost. Taking "love" as the essence of His nature, then all His moral attributes will flow from it. His justice, by which He "rewards every man according to his works." "He is love," but this does not make Him break down the distinction between virtue and vice. "His (love of) delight is in them that fear Him." Hence He rewards the virtuous and punishes the vicious. And what a punishment! "Depart from Me," from your Father, from My love. Revelation takes us up to this point and no further. We never read of that terrible sentence being reversed.

If Mr. Murphy's doctrine were true a great part of Scripture would require to be *recast*. Take for instance, "and there shall in no wise enter into it any-

thing that defileth, but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life"; this should be, in his theory, written thus:—And there shall in every wise enter into it every one, because the name of every one has been written in the "Lamb's book of life." Its admonitions would be *useless*. "Be thus faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," but why the condition of being "faithful unto death"? Won't I get the crown in any case? And its most striking portions would be *without meaning*. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" But where is the point of the question if the soul, on Mr. Murphy's theory, will never be lost? It would be better for him to give up the Bible altogether than to mangle it in this way, and if he don't like to do that, then he should give up the principle that leads to such mutilation. In this dilemma I will leave him for the present. But before closing this letter I would like to revert to the text from which the Bishop of Manchester preached his sermon, and to ask him, if he will have condescension to do it, to be good enough to tell us how it would be "*for the benefit of the sufferer*" that *saving* truths should be "hid from the wise and prudent"? This is the special act of paternal Deity mentioned in that text. And failing to get a reply I shall conclude that none can be given consistent with truth and reason.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, 31st July, 1889.

THE IRISH EXPURGATION OF THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

SIR,—There has been much heat introduced into this question. In fact, it has become personal; most strange, since it is one of mere historical fact, like the question of Queen Mary Casket letters. There is now such a dust that no one can tell what gentlemen are arguing about, and what not. I will try to state what is the common ground of an accepted fact, and what is contested. There is no doubt about what was done to the Athanasian Creed in the Irish Synod. Broad Churchmen began by objecting to assertions about the Trinity and Unity. Then they went on to eliminate distinction between the Deity and the Humanity, till at last they struck out the necessity, in verse 29, of believing rightly the Incarnation. This is historic fact, as certain as that there was a Synod at all. Now we come to the number for and against. For the omission, 116 clergy and 122 laymen; against, 26 clergy and 27 laymen. This is gospel so far. Now the question is as to the component parts of this majority. It consisted wholly of Evangelical and Broad Church. As our Church Paper says, that there was only one Broad Churchman in the Synod, or something to that effect, all the rest were, must have been, Evangelicals, or Low Churchmen. This could be substantiated by giving the names of every clergyman and every layman, with his vote, pro or con. This might cause offence, but it can be done. The whole thing is in the published lists of the two Revision Societies, "The Clerical and Lay Union," and "The Protestant Defence Association." If these authorities are contested, the Synod itself can publish the votes and names. It is a mere historic question, and I don't suppose the combatants, on either side now, took any part in the contest at the time, so that there is no excuse for heat or personality in the discussion of a mere matter of historic fact.

The only use in bringing up the subject is to warn the English clergy and laity of the danger of the Broad Church party leading on the Evangelicals to join them in getting rid of all the peculiar doctrines of the faith.

INQUIRENS.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Adey, Rev. William Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Tarrant Monkton, Dorset.
 Bircham, Rev. Henry, Vicar of St. Paul's, Morley, Leeds.
 Blaydon, Rev. W. B., Vicar of Dullingham, Ely.
 Blencowe, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Christ Church, Chester; Rector of West Kirby.
 Chorlton, Rev. Herbert John Underhill, [M.A., Rector of Winterborne Came, Dorset.
 Cooper, Rev. F. E., Chaplain of All Saints' Convalescent Home, Eastbourne.
 Dunlap, Rev. James Dunlap, Vicar of Corsham, Wilts.
 Footitt, Rev. Charles Edward Walker, Vicar of Threckingham; Vicar of Burton Pedwardine, Seaford.
 Forster, Rev. Bennet, Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Camberwell; Rector of Sevington, Kent.
 Freeman, Rev. G. E., Vicar of Askham.
 Gedge, Rev. W. W., Vicar of Mutford and Rector of Barnby, Beccles.
 Hare, Rev. Marmaduke, Vicar of Clay Hill; Vicar of Christ Church, Watney Street, E.
 Hawksley, Rev. J. E., Curate of Esher; Rector of Puddleshinton.
 Llewellyn, Rev. D. J., Curate-in-Charge of Maesteg; Vicar of Beaufort.
 McLachlan, Rev. J., Rector of Sevington, Kent; Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Camberwell.
 Rosedale, Rev. W. E., M.A., Vicar of Tintern; Rector of Canton.
 Sheringham, Ven. John William, Archdeacon of Gloucester, and Vicar of Standish; Canon in Gloucester Cathedral.
 Squire, Rev. Leonard Harding, M.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints', Kenley.
 Taylor, Rev. John Robert Gleig, M.A., Minor Canon and Subchanter in Hereford Cathedral; Chaplain of St. Martin's Home, Hereford.
 Timbrill, Rev. Alfred Bell, B.A., Curate of Old Swinford; Perpetual Curate of Cradley.
 Walford, Rev. Oliver Sutton, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gosport; Rector of Liss.
 Warren, Rev. J. Shrapnel, Rector of Willoughby; Rural Dean of Calcewaith No. 1, Lincolnshire.
 Williams, Rev. Gerard, M.A., Senior Curate of the Parish Church, Huddersfield; Vicar of Longwood, Huddersfield.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Berkeley, Rev. Miles Joseph, M.A., F.R.S., at Sibbertoft Vicarage, on the 30th ult., aged 86.
 Cleveland, Rev. Henry, M.A., for thirty-nine years Rector of the parish, and J.P. for the North Riding, at Romald Kirk Rectory, Darlington, on the 27th ult., aged 86.
 Collins, Rev. John Ferdinand, at Betterton, Berks, on the 5th inst., aged 76.
 Cossarat, Rev. G. P. Graham, at Winfrith Rectory, Dorset, on the 28th ult., aged 73.
 Fursdon, Rev. Edward, of Fursdon, Devonshire, on the 23rd ult., aged 78.
 Garde, Rev. Thomas Hugh, M.A., T.C.D., at the Rectory, Shenley Mansel, Bletchley, on the 22nd ult., aged 44.
 Peake, Rev. Thomas Cross, M.A., Rector, at Hallaton, on the 5th inst., aged 73.
 Ward, Rev. Thomas Crofts, Vicar of Appleton-le-Street, at Appleton-le-Street, on the 24th ult., aged 29.
 Wolstenholme, Rev. Henry Atherton, at his residence, 2, Columbia-place, Oxton, Birkenhead, late of St. Helen's, on the 4th inst.
 Woodruff, Rev. Richard Francis, at Wistow Rectory, Huntingdon, on the 29th ult., aged 69.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GOSPEL OF THE BLESSED GOD.

BY THE RIGHT REV. E. H. BICKERSTETH,
BISHOP OF EXETER.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. BRIDE'S CHURCH, FLEET STREET, ON THURSDAY EVENING, APRIL 30TH, ON BEHALF OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

"The Gospel of the glory of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust."—1 TIM. i. 11 (R.V.).

THERE were those in Ephesus who contended that the freedom of the Gospel released them from the obligations of the moral law. St. Paul, who was called to Europe, besought Timothy to abide still in Asia Minor, and convince them that the design of the Gospel was charity out of a pure heart and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned. So far from the moral law being abolished by the Gospel of our salvation, every claim of holiness on which that law insists is, the apostle argues, in truest harmony and accordance with the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God, "which"—in deepest gratitude and reverence he adds—"was committed to my trust."

Three great verities are brought before us in these words. First, the blessed God; then the Gospel of His glory; and then the committal of this Gospel to human stewardship. Oh, that the Holy Spirit may breathe on my heart and yours while we ponder together truths which so deeply concern our walk with God and our work for God!

And, first, this remarkable name of the triune Jehovah, whose we are and whom we serve—"the blessed God"—demands our thoughtful and prayerful meditation. The word rendered "blessed" does not primarily signify here one who receives praise and blessing, but bears its ordinary meaning of happy, felicitous, blissful. The reception of praise and adoration must, we may humbly conceive, form part of the blessedness of God, and, speaking after the manner of men, may be said to increase that blessedness. But the term in itself merely signifies "happy." This appears from its use elsewhere in the New Testament. It occurs fifty times, but here only, and in the fifteenth verse of the sixth chapter, where we read of "the blessed and only Potentate," is the word used of God. In all the other forty-eight instances it describes the blessed or happy man, as in the nine beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, or in the seven beati-

tudes of the Book of Revelations. This usage suffices to establish its meaning here. "The blessed God" signifies God who enjoys supreme felicity and infinite delight. Lift up your hearts, my brethren, yes, lift them up unto the Lord, above the smoke and stir, above the cloud and conflict, above the sighs and sobbings of this sinful world. God Himself abides in unutterable felicity. He is the supremely blessed One, as well as the eternal and overflowing wellspring of the blessedness of His servants. We cannot, indeed, grasp or even gaze upon this full-orbed glory of the joy of God. It dazzles us. It is that light that no man may approach unto. But we may reverently ponder it, fragment by fragment. We may humbly trace a broken reflection of it in ourselves; and then, if we are made in the image and after the likeness of God, we must confess that it has the witness in itself. It is self-evidencing; yea, it is a divine necessity. For example, one of the most universally admitted axioms is that life is joy. We see it even in plants and animals. The fields rejoice. The forests clap their hands. The valleys stand so thick with corn that they laugh and sing. The fishes of the sea, the birds of the air, the beasts of the earth, exult in the gift of life. And when we rise to the intelligent creation, the clinging love of life proves its blessedness. "Dear life" is a household word. Now, is it so with us? With God is "the fountain of life." He is the living God. He only has an underived immortality, life in Himself from everlasting to everlasting. Is human life joy? What must the very existence of Divine life be in the triune God? Comprehend we cannot, but confess we must, the infinite felicity of the living God.

Again, the possession and exercise of power when used aright is real joy. This is akin to life; but it is not to be confused with it. A man may live, and yet remain for a while in a state of profound and apparently motionless repose. But the exertion of power possessed is the natural function of life; and when power is employed in works of wisdom and of goodness, it is—it must be—a gratification to the worker in proportion to the magnitude and excellence of the work. Now, God is El Shaddai—the Almighty God. "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" "He speaks, and it is done. He commands, and it stands fast;" and the Divine satisfaction is expressed in the retrospect of the six days' creation. "God saw everything that He had made; and, behold, it was very good." The same law of the Creator's delight in His work must obtain throughout that boundless universe which He has called into being—a delight enshrined in the song of the heavenly elders—"Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." What an insight this thought alone gives us into the boundless felicity of the architect and builder of all things.

So, likewise, holiness is joy. Goodness in itself

is gladness. In his humble degree man experiences this. The saintly wayfarer finds the paths of wisdom to be pleasantness and peace, for holiness is an inner spiritual harmony in which all the faculties of the soul find rest and delight. But if it is so with a man made in the image of God, what must it be in the bosom of the Deity? Surely, as we kneel with the adoring seraphim and cry, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts," a voice within us makes a response: "He is blessed for evermore."

Then need I say that love is joy? When, after his hard day's work of body or brain, the father returns to his home, and his wife greets him with her smile, and his little child runs to him and nestles in his arms and clasps his neck and calls him "Father," and he looks down upon that little one and says, "My child," is it not an overflowing recompense for all his toil? Are not all our choicest treasures in love? Of all the gifts for which we thank God, is not this the crown, the power of loving and of being loved? As that profound thinker, Tauler, said more than 500 years ago, the measure by which we shall be measured is the faculty of love in the soul. We ought to love God and man up to the very farthest limit of our finite being. But God is infinite, and God is love. The Father loveth the Son; the Son abides in the Father's love; the spirit of love searches the depths of God. Nor is this all. God loves the world. His tender mercies are over all His works; and of His Church we read in that fathomless utterances of Zephaniah: "The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty. He will save. He will rejoice over thee with joy. He will rest in His love. He will joy over thee with singing." No words could express more felicity; it is the felicity of the blessed God.

I might add that there is a joy, all its own, if you are one in whom others repose confidence. When, in trouble or in prosperity, a friend instinctively comes to you, saying, "I know that I can trust you; your sympathy never fails me," is not this a pure and genuine delight? Ah! brethren, what must it be with God for the whole family in heaven and in earth to put their trust under the shadow of His wings, and to feel safe under His feathers? It is the prerogative of the blessed God.

One thing more I would name. There is joy for a good man who is serving his generation by the will of God, in recalling the past with all its memory, in grasping the present with all its responsibility, in anticipating the future with all its hopes; even as a traveller delights in looking round from the ridge he has won on the plains and valleys beneath his feet. Now, God is "the high and lofty One who inhabiteth eternity." He sees the end from the beginning. It is true that evil has now broken loose in His beautiful creation, but He sees the ultimate triumph of good. No eye but His might ever bear to gaze all down that drear abyss.

Because none ever saw so clear the shore beyond of endless bliss. If thoughts past utterance fill the Apostle's heart when he exclaims, "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out, for of Him and through Him and to Him are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen." Must not the contemplation of His own universal and everlasting kingdom bring infinite delight and satisfaction to Him who is working all things after the counsel of His own will.

These few fragmentary thoughts on the especial joy of life and power, and goodness and love, and sympathy and hope—thoughts which you will easily multiply and expand and combine—may suffice to assure us that, in the perfections of His own nature, God is immeasurably and unutterably blessed. Nor let us deem these thoughts alien from the great object which draws us together tonight. We are in the stress of the great missionary conflict, but the camp of the Israel of God is overshadowed with a pillar of fire and of cloud. The Lord of Hosts is with us, and the joy of the whole earth is our strength.

Let us pass on, then, to meditate for a few minutes on the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God. The Apostle speaks not only of the Gospel of the blessed God. It would have been much, very much, for fallen man if the Most High, though Himself veiled in an impenetrable cloud of darkness, had vouchsafed to reveal, even though the channel of mercy had been unrevealed, that there was forgiveness with Him that He might be feared. But the Apostle speaks of the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God. This is far more. Glory is a manifestation of excellence. We may take this as a safe key for interpreting the word "glory" in Scripture. So, for example, the tongue is called by the Psalmist his "glory." "Awake up my glory. Awake psaltery and harp. I will sing and give praise with my glory," because the tongue is the organ of the audible manifestation of God. Thus there is only a partial truth in the far-famed saying, "Speech is silvern; silence is golden. Speech is human; silence is divine." Silence, confessedly, is sometimes noble, but speech, not seldom, is nobler still. Silence may edify self, but speech edifies others also. May I venture, with devout reverence, to adduce the sublimest evidence of this? "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory." Glory, I repeat, is the manifestation of excellence. Now, the felicity of the Most High God being, as we have seen, so exceeding great, this excellent joy must needs overflow. We see it in the firmament of His power. "The heavens declare the glory of God." We see it in the earth below. "The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord." Nor do we wonder that,

when He created the heavens and the earth, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Brief, indeed, was that cloudless dawn of the history of man. Sin entered into the world, and death by sin. The land was as the Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desert wilderness. And now a thick cloud was drawn between the creature and his grieved and offended Creator. But should darkness conquer light? Should hell baffle heaven? Should the wiles of the devil thwart the designs of God? Nay, we quietly read over to ourselves, weighing every syllable—for the destiny of the creation is wrapped up in them—the words of the beloved disciple, who had drunk the deepest into the Spirit of his Master: "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil." In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent His only Son into the world that we might live through Him." "Herein is love, not that we love God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be a propitiation for our sins." We only add the words of the Lord Jesus Himself: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter that He may abide with you for ever"; and the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God is unveiled before us in its large and luminous outlines. It is the victory of Divine goodness. Here mercy and truth meet together. Here righteousness and peace kiss each other. All the resources of a wisdom which is never at fault, all the energies of a power which knows no limit, all the outgoings of a love which the needs of the Universe cannot exhaust, are here manifested and displayed. The eternal Father willed this Gospel; so it must needs be sealed with the suffering, even unto death, of His own and only Son. The eternal Son, by His incarnation and spotless life, and patient ministry, and atoning sacrifice, and resurrection and ascension, and all-prevalent intercession, has fulfilled on earth and is fulfilling in the heavens the will of His Father and our Father, His God and ours. The eternal Spirit is brooding over the hearts of the children of men, as He brooded over the waters at the creation, and is fashioning the bride of Christ for her everlasting communion with her Lord. God, in Christ, who is the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the express image of His substance, reconciles the world unto Himself, for it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell, and, having made peace by the blood of His Cross through Him, to reconcile all things in Himself. The Gospel of the glory of the blessed God, of which our text speaks, is the word of reconciliation.

Once grasp the exceeding preciousness and perfectness of this salvation of God, and you will not wonder that St. Paul elsewhere writes: "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," and if any, whatever

their claim to learning or authority, would cast doubt on the living oracles of God, or would question the love of the one Father of us all, or, by introducing human mediators, whether living or dead, would weave again that veil betwixt us and the alone mediation of our Great High Priest which was rent from the top to the bottom when Jesus died on the Cross, or explain away the necessity of personal regeneration and renewal of the soul by God the Holy Ghost, or would deny the everlasting issues of the final judgment, may we never give place to them by subjection—no, not for an hour—that the truth of the Gospel may continue with us. We cannot yield a hair's breadth to those who would tamper with these catholic verities; nor can we, as Churchmen whose faith has been nurtured by a reverential use of our Liturgy, and fortified by the massive doctrines of our Thirty-nine Articles, cease to affirm that "the three creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture," and that "Christ has ordained two sacraments as generally necessary to salvation—baptism and the Lord's Supper," and that "from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons." Nor, as the children of the blessed Reformation, can we cease to protest against the corruptions of the Church of Rome, from the thralldom of which God, in His infinite mercy, delivered our forefathers. These matters of doctrine and of discipline, in our judgment, appertain to the completeness and purity of the Gospel which has been committed to us. As trustees we cannot alienate any part of it without breach of trust.

This is true. But, at the same time, let us remember that the Gospel of the glory of the blessed God is too majestic a thing to be loaded with chains forged on any human anvil. It spurns the littleness of partisanship. It refuses to be bound to frame the Shibboleths of any one school of thought within the wide limits of our beloved Church—

For the love of God is broader
Than the measures of man's mind.

Nay, this Gospel has vivified and is vivifying, has fructified and is fructifying, many other Churches in Christendom beyond our own. It is the gift of God to men. It is heaven-born and free as the air we breathe. Their sin who would narrow it is only less than theirs who would deprave it.

THE Rev. C. Packer, who has resigned the vicarage of Longwood, Huddersfield, has in his thirty-eight year's incumbency over-spent all his income from every ecclesiastical source by more than £1,000.

PREBENDARY PALMES, vicar of St. Germans, has taken charge of the parish of Eythorne, near Dover, for twelve months, and the Rev. E. Buck will take charge of St. Germans during the absence of Mr. Palmes.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHING.

BY THE REV. THOS. JORDAN, M.A., RECTOR OF
MAGHERAFELT, CO. DERRY.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. SWITHIN'S CHURCH,
MAGHERAFELT, ON SUNDAY MORNING, AUGUST
4TH, 1889.

"They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."—DANIEL xii. 3.

THE prophet is showing that the just and the unjust will have their complete reward at the general resurrection. The separation of the evil from the good will then be complete and for ever. Our Blessed Lord, pointing to this passage, says: "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." The marginal reading for "wise" in the authorised, as well as in the revised version, is "teachers." "They that be teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament." One cannot therefore be wrong in drawing strength and cheering encouragement from the Prophet's word for the teachers of Sunday schools in their most useful Christian work. Our Church lays great stress on this. The 8th canon on the duty of catechising is—"It shall be the duty of every incumbent to take care that the young and ignorant within his cure be instructed in the Word of God and the catechism; and to this end it is desirable that every incumbent or curate upon every Sunday or some other convenient time, with the aid of pious and competent persons, being members of the Church of Ireland, shall diligently instruct and teach them in the same," etc. We all act on this rule all over the country, and usually a yearly examination is held in the parishes, with premiums to the children, according to the rules of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. One cannot state too strongly the value of such work in our country. What millions of souls have been won to Christ by Sunday-school teaching will never be known till the judgment day!

I. Looking at our surroundings, this is often to hold up the light in the dark place. The Duke of Argyll speaking of the Olphert Estate in Donegal, on Monday, 15th July last, said: "This part of Ireland was very poor, very ignorant, and very priest ridden. Out of the two and a-half million of voters in England, only 38,000 were returned as illiterate; but out of the 194,000 voters in Ireland 36,722 were returned as illiterate, and out of the 3,600 in Donegal, 3,240 were returned as illiterate—that was, persons not able to fill up and sign a voting paper; and yet these were the people who wished to dictate to Parliament how to shape the constitution of the United Kingdom."*

The Sunday-school teacher is indeed much needed. To be efficient he needs many high qualities, as patience, perseverance, kind bearing, a well-informed mind, and a (a) prayerful heart. Many are his difficulties, some of them inherent in the very nature of the work. Often does one find the truth of what we learned in our school days, that "the pictures drawn in our minds are laid in fading colours, and if not sometimes refreshed, vanish and disappear . . . in some it retains the characters drawn on it like marble, in others like freestone, and in others little better than sand."* The Sunday-school teacher is not to be disheartened by having very often to repeat his lesson. The repetition Sunday he will find a necessary thing, if his teaching is to be got into the minds of his scholars. His rule must be "precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little."

(b.) The present times have made the teaching of the Sunday school doubly necessary in our land. It would appear as if the wrong teaching of Isaiah's day (700 B.C.) were repeating itself, and that it is necessary to say now, as then, "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter."† No greater sin can be than for the leaders of the people to pervert right and wrong, or to make the ignorant and the misguided see them through a false medium. The teacher of the Sunday school gives no uncertain sound, for his lesson is always based on Holy Scripture and on the formularies of our Church, according to a prescribed programme. Right and wrong do not change. The teacher tears away any disguise blinding the plain teaching of God's commands: "Thou shalt do no murder; Thou shalt not steal;" Thou shalt not bear false witness." He shows that these commandments are now exactly as they were 3,000 years ago when written by the finger of God on two tables of stone at Mount Sinai, and that our Blessed Lord adds His divine sanction in His teaching: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil."‡

(c.) The teacher will find great help and guidance in our well-regulated programme carrying on our young people, step by step and class by class, from the plainest and the simplest teaching to the most advanced. When the Apostle was being restored by our Blessed Lord to his office from which he had fallen, one part of his duty was, "Feed my Lambs." In forming the programme, the pastors of our Church felt that they were to lead our children gently onward, always keeping before each class a portion of Holy Scripture and of the Prayer Book. Their desire was

* "An Essay Concerning Human Understanding," Book 2, chap. xi. John Locke.

† Isaiah v. 20.

‡ St. Matt. v. 17.

also to encourage the youth, at a time when the mind is most retentive, to commit to memory some special portions of the Bible and of our Church formularies. We hope and pray that much of this will remain with the scholars even to old age, bearing good fruit all through their life. It is the well-known law of the mind to retain, and to recall, even to the last, the thoughts and the lessons of youth, while many of the events of mature life have faded away and been lost.*

II. We appeal to the Sunday-school teachers to try to raise the standard of teaching and thus to do more lasting good to their scholars. For some years past an effort has been made in this direction among us. A higher voluntary examination has been held each year by the parishes that wish to do so, on an appointed day, by means of printed questions and written answers. The questions are very carefully prepared on the subjects of the programme of religious instruction for the Diocese of Armagh, taking in the appointed portions of the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Prayer Book. It is not meant in the very least to interfere with the usual yearly examinations in each parish, which are conducted orally, and are, as I have said, most useful in very many ways. The high voluntary examination, of which I speak, is merely to carry things to a higher standard, to lead our children to greater accuracy in their Scripture knowledge, and to give them a firmer grasp of these all-important matters.†

The Science and Art Department at South Kensington, London, has been pursuing a plan somewhat like this in scientific subjects, and, making the necessary changes to suit it to our purposes, it has been thought it might carry our children to a higher level of Christian knowledge. Everybody knows that oral teaching is never so exact, as what we write down and taking home with us can refer to and think over. Attending a lecture in science we never take in the lesson or its illustration so completely as when we, as it were, take it home with us, there write it out, and keep it by us in a fixed shape. In the same way if you get a child or a young person to write out the Creed or the Ten Commandments, the beatitudes or the Gospel account of the institution of the Holy Communion, it will be found that an idea is gained of the subject far more exact than any oral teaching can give. It is our plain duty to do our very best in this matter for the precious souls committed to our care, and in this way, if we can, to make our teaching more settled and fixed, and therefore more likely to bear the good fruits of a holy life.

III. The first Christian teaching in the Sunday school and elsewhere is of course oral and always

has been. In dwelling on this one is on an old well-worn road. From the small things of our own day we may be permitted to go up to the greater matters of early Christian times. Theophilus had been orally taught the great facts in the life of our Blessed Lord, and the purpose of the evangelist Luke in writing the third Gospel was that he might have a fuller and more accurate knowledge (*ἐπιγνῶς*) of those things in which he had been catechetically or orally instructed.

One may refer, in all humility, to the great teaching of the Apostle Paul and his mode of procedure among the people of Corinth (say A.D. 53). The Gospel had been made known to them as he had received it from our Blessed Lord. Coming to him from the fount of purity itself, he passed it on undefiled to them. "I delivered unto you," writes the Apostle, "first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."* The great doctrine of the resurrection he goes on to fortify with a series of eye-witnesses, beginning with Peter, ending with himself, and including the appearance to above 500 brethren at once. After the lapse of four years or so (say A.D. 57) the 1st and 2nd Epistles were written unto the Church of God at Corinth. All along the same course of oral instruction has been followed in the first instance, for the same word is used in Church writers for the catechumens (*οἱ κατηχούμενοι*) that is new converts being instructed in the first truths of the Gospel.

In some cases there are difficulties in the way with regard to this higher voluntary examination by printed questions and written answers. The schoolmaster of Lord Brougham, of whom we have all heard, has not been abroad in some places, or if he has, good reading and good writing have not been sufficiently taught. The sooner the difficulties of this sort are got over the better. With elementary national schools for secular teaching on every side, all children, from the 3rd class of our programme upwards, ought to be able to take their part in such an examination as I refer to.

IV. All successful Sunday-school teachers are people of earnest persevering prayer through our Lord Jesus Christ. No aptness in teaching, nor weight of knowledge, will make up for want of this. St. Paul had always those among whom he ministered in his heart in prayer to God. The Apostle of this country, St. Patrick (say A.D. 400), used to rise before day in snow, ice, and rain to have time for prayer. Here I believe was the secret of their success. From these great men of God it is a long step to ourselves; but it is as true of us, as it was of them, that "neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase."† Your work will ever be in accord with

* See, "Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind," chap. vi., of Memory. By Dugald Stewart, vol. I.

† See "Effects produced on the Memory by Committing to Writing our Acquired Knowledge," vol. I., p. 404. Dugald Stewart.

* 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. † 1 Cor. iii. 7.

our ancient scriptural Church, and very earnestly do I trust, that, as it becomes better understood, it will ever be more and more useful. To all who share in it from a right motive, it will ever be a source of very great pleasure and of peaceful satisfaction in life. Bright indeed is the prospect in the future to the eye of faith, from the great word of the prophet in my text, and coming to the teaching of our Blessed Lord, we know that he will, at the last, own your work, done to the least of His brethren, as done to Himself.

CHRISTIAN DUTIES IN PERILOUS TIMES.

NO. II.—REDEEMING THE TIME.

BY THE REV. E. A. COOKE, VICAR OF ATTLEBOROUGH, NUNEATON; AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE OF S. COLUMBA."

COURSE OF SIX SERMONS PREACHED DURING LENT, 1889, AT ATTLEBOROUGH.

"Redeeming the time, because the days are evil."—EPHES. v. 16.

IN the previous discourse I endeavoured to show that many of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and the predictions of the Apostles, point to a great development of evil in the final period of the Christian era. In the passage before us the Apostle tells the Ephesians that evil and perilous days have come, and hence greater necessity for more than ordinary self-devotion, and a more diligent use of that time which remains. If, therefore, the days are evil and our present surroundings exceptionally perilous, does it not furnish a strong motive to our redeeming the time, and force us to inquire how we may best fulfil a great duty? The Apostle felt this, and solemnly warned the Ephesians against open and secret sins (which he enumerates in this chapter) such as are only too common amongst ourselves in this nineteenth century. He exhorts them to renounce those vices in which they indulged, to try to realise the blessings conveyed through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and, knowing them to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers, points them to One who can carry them through all temptations.

Now, our subject to-day naturally divides itself into three heads: First, Our duty, "Redeeming the time"; secondly, How? "By walking circumspectly"; thirdly, Why? "Because the days are evil."

The first thing, then, we are to consider is, what we are to understand by "redeeming the time." The word in Hebrew which we render redeem (*gāal*) signifies to ransom something by paying back the price to him that bought it, as in Lev. xxv. 25. "If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away some of his possession, and if any

of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold." The same word is applied to God as delivering or redeeming His people from Egypt. Then if we turn to the New Testament we find the Greek word (*ἐξαγοράζω*) rendered to redeem, signifies buying goods before they are brought to stall or market in order to make the largest possible profit from them. In this sense the word is also used by St. Paul writing to the Colossians (iv. 5). "Conduct yourselves with wisdom towards those without the Church and forestall opportunity." The same counsel is inculcated, but differently expressed, when writing to the Galatians (vi. 10). "Therefore, as we have opportunity (*καιρὸν*) or time, let us do good to all men." In other words, as there a season for reaping, so there is one for sowing. As we have it then, let us act accordingly and make the most of it.

It is a metaphor taken from merchants that diligently observe the time of buying and selling and easily part with their pleasures for gain. The term "time" signifies more than the mere duration of anything or the measure of motion; it may be taken for opportunity, or the favourable moment for doing anything which, if lost, can never be recovered. This is well brought out in Ecclesiastes (viii. 5) "A wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment," that is, he knows both what he ought to do, and the fittest season in which to do it. So, then, we understand that time is redeemed when we diligently embrace and improve all the opportunities which God places in our way, not only for His honour and glory, but also for the good of ourselves and others, not allowing these golden opportunities to be forestalled or stolen from us and irretrievably lost by our own negligence.

The exhortation of the Apostle implies that the Ephesians had lost and misimproved opportunities, and that being so they were not to be depressed, but were to double their diligence and do the more good in time to come. My brethren, if this was a solemn warning to the Ephesian Christians, how much more solemn for us, brought up as we are, amid Christian surroundings, acquainted from our earliest years with the word of God, which ought to have made us wise unto salvation, and surrounded by influences which should have ministered to our highest interests.

If we look back over our bygone days do we not hear a voice speaking to us of hours wasted in folly and pleasure, of opportunities misused, of duties unfulfilled, time lost in sleep and self-indulgence, our whole past life a failure. The past has a voice for us, which bids us "gather up the fragments that remain" of time, of talents, of opportunity, and employ them in God's service, for His glory, and the good of our fellow-men. May God enable us to rise, phoenix-like, from the ashes of torpor and indifference, to renewed vigour, forget

ting those things which are behind (those sins and impediments), and reaching forth (like one running for a prize) unto those things which are before, pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Secondly, we are to consider in what way we are to "redeem the time." The answer is at once supplied in the fifteenth verse, which is really part of the passage, "by walking circumspectly," not as fools (who walk they care not how), but as wise men." But what are we to understand by this word circumspectly? The Greek word (*ἀκριβῶς*), of which this is a translation, signifies exactness. Although literally correct it is scarcely intelligible to the English reader. The Latin *circum*, (around), and *specio*, *spectrum*, (to look) seems to be more expressive. It is to walk cautiously, watchfully, accurately. It means, in short, looking round on all sides watchfully. Like some insects naturalists tell us of, the Christian is to be all eyes, watching keenly before and behind, on the right hand and on the left, for everything that may happen to lie in his path. But towards whom were they to walk circumspectly? In the first place, no doubt, to those who have not yet come to the true knowledge of Christ; to the world at large, "towards them that are without," that is, outside the Church, whether Jew or Gentile.

The Apostle endeavoured to impress upon the Ephesian and Colossian Christians that, as they themselves had experienced something of that blessedness which is the natural result of union with Christ, they were to walk in wisdom towards unbelievers, shedding over them some of the hallowing rays of religion.

But whilst the duty of circumspection is enforced towards those without the Church, it is no less to be observed towards those professing godliness. An obligation is laid upon us all to bring forth the fruits of a certain holy influence, so that our fellow-men would be better for our existence instead of being injured by our inconsistent lives. There is a debt we owe them which is daily increasing, and from which none of us can escape.

The Apostle felt this when he said, "I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise." Believe me, there is nothing more important, in our dealings with one another, than a consistent, correct, and circumspect walk, for it is this before all else that marks us as Christ's disciples. This thought seems to have influenced David when he said, "I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way; I will walk within my house with a perfect heart."

Observe, he says, "within my house," for it was there especially he was to behave himself wisely. And this very epistle to the Ephesians shows us in a marvellous way how we are to act in the ordinary relationships of everyday life as husband and wife, master and servant, parent and child, adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour in everything.

And this brings us, lastly, to a great and special reason for "redeeming the time"—"because the days are evil." In what respect were the days evil? What was there in the condition of the Ephesians that drew forth from the Apostle this warning? Living, as they did, in the midst of a luxurious, dissolute people, whose chief characteristic was devotion to the goddess Diana, he felt such a warning was especially needed. He reminds them that they had been delivered from the death of sin to living fellowship with Christ by God's grace, and that it was by the blood of Christ they were brought nigh, in whom both Jew and Gentile were united, and built into a noble temple which God by His Holy Spirit would deign to inhabit. Having been delivered from sin they were to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.

But what are we to understand by the "evil days"? The word which is translated evil (*πονηρός*) may also be rendered malignant, mischievous, wicked, and is primarily taken for sin, whether moral or criminal, as in Eccl. ix. 3. "The heart of the sons of men is full of evil." Bishop Jeremy Taylor* explains it: "Aptness to do shrewd turns, to delight in mischiefs and tragedies; a loving to trouble our neighbour, and to do him ill offices; crossness, perverseness, and peevishness of action in our intercourse"; and it is sometimes put for dangers and calamities (especially such as are borne for religion's sake) which a prudent man will use every lawful means of averting. Few will, I think, deny that the present days are evil, and that now, as then, the "whole world lieth in the wicked one." We are still in the enemy's country, and the great arch-enemy of souls is going about "seeking whom he may devour." Evil is rampant, the friendship of the world is enmity against God, and the world is full of sin, troubles and sorrow. Men are lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that do good, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. With such a mass of iniquity lying before us, around us, at our very doors, we who are spiritual are called upon to shine as lights in the world, to hold forth God's word to the ungodly and unconverted, bringing them above the mists of error, doubt, and unbelief, into the clear atmosphere of Christian light. Surely, my brethren, we have here a wide field for the exercise of every Christian grace and experience, and weighty reasons why we should now "redeem the time."

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have made a grant of £1,000 in augmentation of the benefice of Christ's Church, Eccleston, St. Helen's.

* Doctrine and Practice of Repentance, iv. i.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESSE, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation. **OBESITY IS CURED**, besent,

gratis and post free, on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 17, 1889.

WANTED—A GOSPEL FOR THE CENTURY.

AN article with the above title appears in the last number of the *Nineteenth Century*. It is by a Roman Catholic priest, and it betrays, in every page, the fact, of which few persons are any longer unaware, that the heart-searchings and perplexities of our age of transition afflict, as severely as they do ourselves, those who imagine themselves to be directed by an infallible guide. The author steps forward as in the mantle of a prophet, and declares that he can read *Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*, written upon the wall of modern civilisation in characters of flame and fire.

The social organism, as we have received it from our fathers, is deeply decayed, and its spirit gone. What man is there but confesses in private that great and unknown changes are hanging over us? But though we cannot foretell them in detail, we may have a strong presentiment of the direction they will take. The present state of society is doomed by its inherent contradictions to pass away. That which once was—feudalism, monarchism, Whiggism [why does not Father Barry add Papalism?]—will not return. Re-action is the dream of pious souls sitting by the chimney-corner, and indulging in their after-dinner nap. History to such is a sealed volume, else they might learn therein that the past never comes out of its grave as it went down thither. We shall not look upon the like of what they dream again. Restorations do not really happen. . . . The past does not live a second time, but the future is made of it.

Our author's view of the state of the contemporary world is very lurid, and not untinged with a spirit of exaggeration, which we think is not Hebrew but Hibernian.

See the price we have paid for wanton theorising, for that "insane license of affirmation" which ran riot until men could bear it no longer, and became deists and freethinkers

to escape its fury. Divorced from spiritual convictions, science has advanced, conquering and to conquer. It has multiplied its marvels, which elate the spirit of Mr. Smiles as he enlarges on them, and which drive Socialists and Anarchists to assault civilised society as embodying every ill, and as deifying brute force, inhuman cunning, and the power of wealth acquired by unrighteousness. Religion, secluded the while in her cathedral stalls, may chant lovely anthems, and wear copes of brodered gold. But where is the multitude that should throng nave and aisles? Outside I say, brawling, drinking, tearing their bread from one another, working, with despair in their hearts the while, as many hours as they can toil and live.

There is a question with which we have yet to grapple—the cause of all this accumulated, heart-breaking misery. It is an evil that has spread far and wide, and it is this—Christian preachers talk of the dead Christ in their pulpits and forget that He is living. They see men thronging luxurious banquets, and they fear to remind them of the anathema pronounced against their swallowing down the lives and the substance of the worker. Is there a greater sin than to murder men by slow starvation? The rich non-producer—be he Jew, or Catholic, or Infidel—dyes his hands in that sin every day he lives. He is part and parcel of a system which calls itself the social order. What if we told him seriously, told ourselves first of all, that there is no genuine social order save the kingdom of Christ, into which the idle rich cannot enter? It has been argued that Dives, who does nothing but lounge at the clubs, and spends thousands at the clubs, and spends thousands on his enjoyment, is not without his uses; that he points to the rewards of toiling ambition. I ask in reply, what place is there for Dives in the kingdom of Christ? Do we find in him, or the system to which he belongs, ought of that three-fold reverence which, to Goethe's mind, made the sum of possible religions? His attitude towards things above is agnosticism; towards things around him, scepticism; towards things beneath him, cynicism. Cynically he buys (with money not earned by himself) the labour of the working-man's son, the purity of the working-man's daughter. "Yes," he may answer me, "it is a free bargain; both are willing to sell." When he has wrought his will upon them, he flings the son to the workhouse, the daughter to the streets or the hospital. Let those who are not ashamed to call themselves Christians ponder these things. They say they believe in a living Christ. When will they open their eyes and judge the nineteenth century, and their place in it, as he did the first?

All this is extreme exaggeration in the vein of Mr. O'Brien and *United Ireland*, applied to the spiritual condition of the world. There are idle and luxurious rich, but not nearly so many in proportion as in years gone by; and there are poor people in unmerited misery: but the condition of the labouring class is steadily improving; their happiness and well-being have enormously increased; and the attention that has been directed to them, and the diligent study which they are receiving, and the judicious efforts that are being made to improve the material conditions under which they live, is bearing fruit, which coming generations will reap. And to charge the rich man with the guilt of all or of most of the sufferings of the poor is an extreme injustice. He does not buy at an unjust price the labour of the poor man's son; and when a poor man's daughter loses her honour, it is in almost every case a poor man's son that leads her astray.

As to the cause of all these evils, Mr. Barry traces them of course to the Reformation. *Cela*

va sans dire: he would not have been a Roman priest if he had not attributed them to that cause.

Luther, trampling humanity under foot, condemned Aristotle in the same breath as Thomas Aquinas looked on reason as Satan's handmaid, or something worse, and, as might readily be shown—from the pages of Professor Janssen, for instance—retarded or threw back the civilisation of Germany for two hundred years. The Reformation was essentially a protest against science and human freedom. (!)

He allows, however, that Sextus IV. and Leo X. might sacrifice to frivolous humanism the duties of their high office, and that the names of Kepler and Galileo still make the ears of Churchmen tingle. He thinks that from the Reformation downwards the Church has permitted science to take its own way, and thus to separate itself from religion, while it has occupied itself on unprofitable controversies, which could not possibly lead to any result.

The remedy that he proposes is, that the Church should reconcile herself with science in general, and specially with Social Science, which he thinks is the one science of the future, and that she should take Socialism in hand, which, however, he does not define, nor, apparently, clearly understand.

It is rapidly becoming a fact that all problems, even those which might seem purely scientific, lead to Socialism. I am not concerned at present with the definition of that much-abused term. Enough that it indicates the whereabouts of the malady from which civilised mankind are suffering. Let us call it "labour and capital," "the distribution of wealth," "the condition of the working classes," or what we please—by any name it will be as terrible—only let us not forget that it is the one great business of religious men, if they hope in the future of their creed as an imperial influence, to take it now in hand.

We thoroughly agree with Father Barry that social questions bearing on the condition of the people are the great questions of the day, though we do not believe that the study of these will lead any reasonable persons to be advocates of socialised property or socialised land. Legislation for the good and happiness of all, without injuring or plundering any, and an increase of Christian charity will diminish and perhaps extinguish all the distress that does not come as the direct punishment of sin.

It remains to be seen what part Father Barry hopes his Church may take in the matter. He twice repeats that the Christian creed, by which of course he means the ecclesiastical organisation, which he supposes to be the only maintainer of that creed, must be an *imperial* influence. He would not have been a Roman if he had forgotten, even for a moment, the grand claim of Rome to universal empire:—

Tu regere imperio gentes, Romane, memento.

But in advancing his claim he is very much afraid that he will be suspected of a design to *exploit* Socialism in favour of his Church.

I am quite alive to the objection which a Socialist may raise if he chances to read these lines. He will say, "We do not want our schemes to be *exploited* by Catholicism, or by any other form of Christianity."

Now the important point to consider here is that the Socialist's suspicion is true. The Catholic, who coquets with Socialism, does wish to exploit it in favour of his Church. Father Barry himself is not clear of this *arriere pensée*. But so also does the Anglican wish to exploit it for Anglicanism; and the Nonconformist for Nonconformity. It is this by-end of every sect that destroys religious influence: just as the personal and party aims of politicians have degraded politics in every country. Let every religious body get rid of its by-end—its *arriere pensée*. Then perhaps the Creed, but not (please God) the clergy, may become again a power, which will be at once imperial and beneficent.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—Mr. Murphy, in his letter of the 3rd inst., gives up the parable of the Prodigal and of Dives as not being conclusive on his side of the question. He also relegates to the same place the two texts, Rom. xi. 16 and James i. 18, though he says that they "strongly suggest" his doctrine. But his manner of trying to bring out the supposed "suggestion" is not at all convincing. "If the root be holy, so are the branches"; this, he says, "is true in the sense meant by St. Paul." Of course it is; no one ever disputed that. But what the sense is he does not say, nor does he appear to know; and, *without knowing* the sense of the Apostle, he proceeds to say that mankind are holy in the *same* way! He does not appear to see the *petitio principii* running through his reasoning. He *assumes* that his sense and the Apostle's sense of holiness are the same, and then *concludes* that they are the same!

I am thankful for any ray of light coming from Scripture, either by "suggestion" or otherwise, but I think he will hardly blame me for not "allowing any importance" to *his* suggestions, which are evolved in this illogical way. Nor can it be said that I "certainly err" in looking for demonstration, when we are commanded to "Prove all things," and when the Church says that "whatsoever is not *proved* by Holy Scripture is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith." His words imply that he has no demonstration to offer for his side of the question, but only "suggestions"; and he seems to think that I should prefer his "suggestions" to the demonstrations which I can produce for my own side. I would fain hope that he is not so fatuous as to think that I would act such a part.

His assertion that "proof is seldom attainable in moral and spiritual questions" does not agree with the text quoted above, to "Prove all things"; and his quotation that "truth is something not to be proved, but to be seen," is only a mark of the inanition of him who composed it, because truth cannot be seen unless it be *proved* to be truth.

He says: "It is not honouring God to try to prevent faith from outrunning dogma. His written promises are to be trusted; but it is a strange way of honouring

Him to say, as we say of some men, that He is to be trusted to the extent of His written promises, but on further." My reply to this is that to trust Him for what He has not promised in His written word to perform is not trust at all, but *presumption*. But why all this talk about the necessity of "faith *outrunning* dogma?" Of its going to the region where dogma is not to be found? Why insist on trusting God *beyond* the "extent of his written promises"? If it has any relevancy to the subject under discussion, it implies that he believes his restoration theory is not to be found among the dogmata of Scripture; is not to be found in His "written promises"; that is to say, not to be found in the Bible at all. If this be his belief, why did he not tell us of it at the beginning? And why write anything more on the subject? He may trust God as much as he likes for what is *not in the written word*; I have no quarrel with him on that score. My business is only with what I find in the Bible; and since he admits that final restoration is not there, he gives up the point in dispute, and so the controversy should end. There is no necessity for me to say anything further on his letter, save that I will ask him to take his favourite text, "God is love," as one premiss of a syllogism, and to join along with it as another, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (which is the final sentence on mankind—a sentence, be it remarked, concerning which we know of no limitation nor mitigation, and which we never read of as being reversed). Then, if he can gather from these two premisses that all men will be finally saved, I can only deplore the infelicity of his reason, which can draw such a conclusion from such premisses. And I must say that I notice also, with deep regret, his wilful misquoting of Scripture, as he does the 32nd verse of Romans xi., the word "men" not being in the Authorised nor Revised Version, as he states. The words in the Authorised Version are: "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all"; and in the Revised Version: "God hath concluded all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all."

But that "them all" refers not to mankind, but to "all Israel," is evident from the context. He had said in verse 26, "And so all Israel shall be saved." Why? Because "He hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy on all" (verse 32). The subject of "all Israel" continues without a break in the context from verse 26 to verse 32. But, on the supposition that it did refer to all mankind, it does not prove his point, because the Apostle is there speaking, not of the *effects*, but of the *purposes* of His grace, which are often interfered with through blindness of mind, hardness of heart, and unbelief.

That God has used good men as instruments for founding churches and doing good to others is patent to the most casual reader of the Bible; but it is palpably absurd to say that because some people possess "the holiness without which no man shall see the Lord," others also possess it; or because people who have it are saved, that, *on their account*, others who have it not will be saved also. Eli was a good and holy man, but this does not warrant us in saying that his sons were good and holy, or that his righteousness would be a covering for them, so that they, without personal righteousness, would be accepted with God. This would be the Romish doctrine of Works of Supererogation in the righteousness of the saints.

St. Paul says: "He is not a Jew which is one *outwardly*, neither is that circumcision which is *outward* in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*, and circumcision is that of the *heart* in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God." That is to say, there are two kinds of holiness, the *outward* and the *inward*, but that it is the latter which renders us acceptable to God. *Every* Jew was holy outwardly by being outwardly circumcised, and by becoming in this way a member of God's visible Church; in accordance with Deut. vii. 6: "For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God." But every Jew had not *inward* holiness; this is too evident to need demonstration.

If Mr. Murphy will kindly observe this distinction between outward and inward holiness, he will observe a beautiful consistency in the words of the Apostle in Rom. xi. 16, and at the same time the absurdity of his own interpretation.

The whole human race does not possess the outward holiness, because they are not all members of the visible Church; and it is, without doubt, flagrantly absurd to say that they *all* have the inward holiness. The Apostle does not say that Israel was holy for the *sake* of the Patriarchs, but he is giving us a *reason* why we should regard the lump as holy, from the fact that the firstfruits and the lump must always partake of the *same* nature. R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, August 9th, 1889.

SIR,—It is very difficult to deal with men who assume airs of superiority. I suppose it is hopeless to think of convincing them. There is very much to be said in favour of the habit, and especially this—The world generally takes men at their own valuation. There is this, however, to be said against it: The avenues to the mind for truth and righteousness are closed by it. Meekness, gentleness, and humility are the surest handmaids of those virtues which commend themselves to the great Father of Light.

I would here, also, like to suggest to "J. B." the propriety of thinking out (1) The dear Redeemer's words, "I thank thee, Father, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, but hast revealed them unto babes"; (2) St. Paul's words, "Ye know your calling, brethren, how that not many wise. . . ."

And we ought, as I think, to thank heaven that the inception of truth does not depend on intellect. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." And so all, whether intellectual or not, may be saved.

But now, to have done with preliminaries, and to proceed to work, let me notice in order "J. B.'s" remarks.

(1.) May I ask him to point out where, in the Scheme of Redemption, ample means are provided to correct defective and perverted faculties, when man chooses to reject God's offers of mercy? To choose means to exercise the will. To be in a position to learn man must be willing: "If a man will, he shall know. . . ." Man does not and will not submit his will to God's will; then how can he know? It seems to me that "J. B." has here a very difficult problem to solve.

(2.) I am very glad to find that "J. B." offers no objection to my second position, "We must accept God's plain teaching found in the Bible." I am sorry that he does not see the only deduction, "We must not set up our opinions against His plain teaching."

(3.) But he thinks we have ; and he says that the above deduction warrants his describing me as a "Daniel come to judgment." I do not mind sneers. They are poor arguments. The case that needs them is a sorry one. Mr. Murphy enables us, by expressing his opinion well and courageously, to set forth this point clearly. He says, and I suppose "J. B." would coincide, that "because God is love all men will be saved." This is an opinion. It is no deduction from God's truth. In the Bible it is written, "The wicked shall be turned into hell." "The wages of sin is death." "The carnal mind is enmity against God." There is no warrant anywhere for our assuming that reformation and salvation after death are possible. I could wish that "J. B." could witness, first, the death-bed of a Christian, and then that of one passing away without any hope. If intellect could perceive the difference he would then know ; but perception is only possible by the help of God's grace. Oh, for more grace !

(4.) The opinions of thousands of intellectual men must not be assumed to weigh one *iota* against God's truth. This ought to go without the saying. But does not "J. B." see that it is dogmatic to say that we need no dogma ? It is also contradictory in terms.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Hotel de l'Europe, Salzburg,
August 5th, 1889.

SIR,—With reference to Mr. Donaldson's letter in the PULPIT of August 3rd, I hold that it is perfectly legitimate to refer to moral instincts and kindly sympathies in testing the validity of any set of dogmas. I do not mean *my* impressions, intelligence and kindly feelings, but those I observe to belong to human nature in our days. It is clear to my own mind that the development of the moral sensibilities has been progressive, since the Bible became accessible to the masses, with gradually increased facilities for its acquisition by all. This is finely illustrated in Macaulay's well-known critique on Gladstone's "Church and State." The tone and expression of public feeling did not prevent Gardiner from giving directions for the execution of heretics ; but Archbishop Laud was restricted to the pillory, and Lord Clarendon, in the Act against Conventicles, could not go beyond imprisonment ; while, in more recent times, even the penalty of civil disabilities became intolerable. In our own era Howard found inhumanity of a frightful kind in prison arrangements ; Lord Ashley laboured assiduously to deliver women and children from great cruelties ; Sir Samuel Romilly pleaded earnestly and successfully for a modification of the Criminal Code, which at that time inflicted death for all classes of theft, even petty larceny. The horrors of the slave trade, and the injustice and demoralising inhumanity of slavery, have gradually been abandoned by civilised nations. The scourge of war has been rendered far less devastating and pitiless than formerly. One of the most signal contrasts to old times is the remarkable increase of efforts to relieve sorrow and suffering, and to diffuse enlightened knowledge.

It is my firm conviction that these beneficial changes are mainly due to the circulation of the Bible, which has brought the hallowed and benignant maxims and precepts of the Saviour and the Apostles impressively before the multitude, so that the duty of doing good has gradually become an inseparable feature of modern civilisation.

I suppose almost any impartial person must admit that those who were accustomed to the cruelties and barbarities which have been enumerated were not very well qualified to interpret the Scriptural declarations concerning the relations of God to man. If our era has made such important alterations in a beneficent direction as regards the dealings of man with man, and if we have modified the maxims and practices of our forefathers in such a material degree, can it be justly pretended that the men of our day are to be debarred by harsh words and unproved asseverations from examining the dogmas which those cruel ages handed down to us ?

In regard to heaven, I contend that the conceptions brought forward by most preachers are not in harmony with the Bible, and do violence to the tender sensibilities which have been developed and intensified by the perusal of that hallowed Book. To my mind such a heaven as they present is an impossibility, as those who have been trained in the school of Christ could not be happy unless permitted to strive earnestly for the relief of sorrow and suffering, and for the diffusion of truth and love. As a matter of fact, I seldom hear a sermon in which there is any reference to eternal punishments.

J. B.

Canonbury, 3rd August, 1889.

THE IRISH CHURCH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—As I was a member of the Synod of the Church of Ireland from the first, and attended continuously until 1883, may I venture to interpose in the controversy found again in your columns on the subject of the Athanasian Creed, and the treatment it met with in the Synod of the Church of Ireland. There is no doubt that among sundry proposals made, debated, and put to the vote, was one to strike out the statement—"Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he (a Christian man) also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." I forget about my vote on this particular occasion. But I uniformly voted against, and once or twice spoke, reprobating what I then and still consider a most improper mode of dealing with clear official statements bearing upon the fundamentals of the Christian faith. And what grieved me almost as much was the fact that those who led or followed in this movement were very good men of the Evangelical, and some also very good and scholarly men of the Broad Church School. There is no use in denying this fact. It is on record. And this movement occasioned other consequent steps. Thus there were sundry meetings held and certain action taken. A meeting was held at Morrison's Hotel, *ad rem*, at which I was not present. Another meeting was held at the Palace, St. Stephen's Green, Dr. Trench, the late Archbishop of Dublin, in the chair, and a vigorous opposition was organised. I remember particularly the Rev. Mr. Hewitt, of Rathgar, taking a prominent part. Also, I for one, availing myself of a clause in the Church Act, formally claimed exemption from clerical responsibility in the event of such a radical change as was now impending being carried out. I thank God the change was not carried out, the number of such protests alarming the instigators of change, as was commonly reported. About the same time, also, the Unitarians were so elated with hopes of the adhesion of the Church of Ireland in a body to their heresy, that they sent to the

Irish clergy by post gratuitous copies of "Channing's Works." There is no use in denying the action taken in the Synod any more than the actors. As to the general matter of fact, "C. C." is perfectly correct in his remarks. And even though worthy Mr. Murphy and the mythical Mr. E. Lawrence (who used to spell his assumed name with "u," but now uses a "w") "doubt the fact"—as the Scotchman said—*fact it remains*, as "C. C." has put it. We ought all join in praises to God defending His Church from such serious calamity.

PHILIP DWYER.

THE ORNAMENT RUBRIC.—MR. TOMLINSON.—DEAN PEROWNE.

SIR,—Mr. Tomlinson says that the Ornaments Rubric was only intended to condemn what was not legal in the second year of Edward VI. But its language is to sanction rather than condemn. The question is, What was legal in that year, and thus sanctioned? I have before me Edward's Act of 1552. It is impossible from that to make out what was legal and what not. What was in use, and not condemned, can be our only guide as to what was legal. The Dean would make the Rubric only permissory. The Privy Council, if I mistake not, would have made it condemnatory instead of mandatory. Will you allow me to tell you how we got rid of it in Ireland? A copy out of the Rolls Court, I think, was produced, which wanted the page with Ornaments Rubric. A bright thought struck us, viz., that the copy you sent over to us wanted that leaf, so that we never adopted it. The page before had "the catch-word" to, which answers to first word on missing page, whereas next page begins with "the," so that this theory was absurd. Besides, the leaf had the rules "to find Easter for ever" on the other side. The idea, then, that our copy, which was yours, had not the Ornaments Rubric, and was adopted without it, was incredible. Yet, on that ground alone, our Irish Synod drew the sword and cut the Gordian knot. This showed what they thought of it. I fear you will not get rid of it in and other way. Our Irish mode answers exactly to what we did as to the Athanasian Creed, Catechism, and New Preface.

INQUIRENS.

THE *Temperance Chronicle* says that the Rev. Patrick Watson is about to resign the incumbency of Christ Church, Battersea. In an address issued some time ago to his parishioners he declares himself unable any longer to minister in a pew-rented church.

THE Bishop of Rochester set apart a deaconess at a service held on Friday week in the chapel of the Rochester Diocesan Deaconess Institution at Clapham. She had received two years' training as a probationer at the institution, where several ladies are now preparing for the office of Deaconess. Their training is carried on under Diocesan Head Deaconess, Mrs. Gilmore, and the Warden, the Rev. John Toone, with the direct supervision of the Bishop.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE Bishop of Newcastle has gone abroad for some weeks, and asks that during his absence diocesan communications may be addressed to the Archdeacons of Northumberland and Lindisfarne.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Atkinson, Rev. Richard Cleator, M.A., Curate of Wath; Vicar of Yedingham, near Malton.
 Bedford, Rev. W. Campbell Riland, M.A., Vicar of Knowle.
 Bell, Rev. James Allen, M.A., Vicar of Hayling Island, Hants; Vicar of St. Paul's, Southampton.
 Bond, Rev. John Edward Gordon, Vicar of Savernake; Rector of Ashmore.
 Chevallier, Rev. John, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford; Rector of Great Horwood, Bucks.
 Douglas, Rev. James Wescomb, B.A., Vicar of Aldermaston, Reading; Rector of Monnington-on-Wye.
 Haggard, Rev. Christopher, M.A., Rector of Filleigh and East Buckland; Rural Dean of South Molton.
 Huxtable, Rev. Edgar, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Piddlehinton, Dorchester; Vicar of St. John's, Truro.
 Jones, Rev. Donald, Curate of Aughton, Ormskirk; Priest-Vicar of Lichfield Cathedral.
 Kitson, Rev. Benjamin Meredith, Vicar of All Saints', Clapton; Chaplain to the Sisters of the Faith, Stoke Newington.
 Langton, Rev. Frederick William, M.A., Curate of St. Augustine's, Haggerston; Vicar of Wolvercote, Oxon.
 Lee, Rev. William, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Gosport.
 McArthur, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Westminster; Rector of St. Michael's, Workington.
 Mitchell, Rev. Joseph, M.D., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist's, New Wortley, Leeds; Vicar of St. John's, Yealand Conyers, Carnforth.
 Mortlock, Rev. Charles Frederick, M.A., Curate of Ospringe, Kent; Vicar of South Bersted, Bognor.
 Newman, Rev. Frederick William, Vicar of St. George's, Truro.
 Payne, Rev. Samuel Ward, LL.D., Rector of Delamere, Chester.
 Ryan, Rev. Vincent John, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Bradford; Vicar of Manfield, near Darlington.
 Scobell, Rev. Edward Chessall, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Gloucester; Vicar of Upton St. Leonard's.
 Selby-Lowndes, Rev. Octavius William Cotton, Curate of Whaddon, Stony Stratford; Rector of Mursley, Bucks.
 Sweet-Escott, Rev. William, B.A., late Rector of Brompton Ralph, Wiveliscombe; Rector of Penarth-with-Lavernock, Glamorganshire.
 Talbot, Rev. Reginald Thomas, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Gateshead; Honorary Canon in Durham Cathedral and Lecturer in Church Doctrine and History for the Dioceses of Durham, Ripon, and Newcastle.
 Thorn, Rev. John Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Stoneleigh; Honorary Canon in Worcester Cathedral.
 Thornewill, Rev. Charles Francis, M.A., Vicar of Burton-on-Trent; Rector of Drayton-Basset, near Tamworth.
 Weber, Rev. Edward Percival Baker, Curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Brighton; Vicar of Sheepwash.
 Williams, Rev. Watkin Herbert, Vicar of Bodelywyddan, Chancellor of St. Asaph's Cathedral, and Rural Dean; Archdeacon and Canon of St. Asaph.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Cockett, Rev. William, M.A., forty-three years Vicar of Upperby, at Upperby Vicarage, Carlisle, on the 19th ult., aged 73.
 Fidler, Rev. John Mortier, Vicar, at St. Matthew's Vicarage, Prince's Square, E., on the 3rd inst.
 Hill, Rev. J. W., M.A., Vicar of Waverton, near Chester, on the 12th inst.
 Neate, Rev. Richard Henry, M.A., for thirty-two years Vicar of Walden, at St. Paul's Vicarage, Walden, Welwyn, aged 71.
 Parr, Rev. John, Vicar of Kenton, at Kenton, on the 9th inst., aged 57.



The Church of England Pulpit.

PEACE AND PROSPERITY CONDITIONAL ON OBEDIENCE.

BY THE REV. C. P. ROBERTS, M.A., RECTOR OF LONGSIGHT, MANCHESTER.

SERMON PREACHED IN MANCHESTER CATHEDRAL AT THE ANNUAL GATHERING OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOLS, ON WHIT-MONDAY, 1889.

"Happy are the people that are in such a case, yea blessed are the people who have the Lord for their God."—PSALM cxliv. 15 (P. B. version).

I DO not think that we could anywhere find a better description of a prosperous community, with all the elements that must be combined to make up its material prosperity, than the description which is given in the latter part of this 144th Psalm. In the first place, as the most important, the men—its sons; they are likened to young trees, or * plants grown large in their youth, waxing strong in vigorous activity, shooting upwards with powerful energy as they progress in the open air of public life towards the full development of which it and they are capable. Then the women—its daughters: they are likened to fair decorated pillars, or beautifully sculptured corner stones, which impart grace as well as strength to the interior of a building, remaining peacefully in their own places, adorning the domestic temple with modest loveliness—their gentle natures unfitted to cope with the strains and trials, or at all events the storms and tempests, of the rougher atmosphere of public life.

Then the food supply of the people; abundant supplies of bread and all kinds of produce necessary for subsistence; garners full and plenteous with all manner of store: sheep bringing forth thousands and ten thousands in the open fields. Then prosperity in agriculture and business; "oxen strong to labour" and drag the plough, strong to carry their burdens of commerce. Next the peace and security which reigns, with no danger of assault from foreigners, no risk of being carried into captivity by a conquering foe, through breaches made in the wall. Then the happy contented state of the inhabitants amongst themselves; all prosperous; no bitter cry of an outcast portion; "no complaining in the open places where the people commonly assemble near the gate." Well may the Psalmist exclaim as he completes the description, "Happy are the people that are in such a case!"

And rightly does he go beyond this and recognise that there is something further and deeper still required to fill up the measure of a community's happiness; something without which all material prosperity is liable to lead astray its possessor, tending to puff up with pride those who enjoy it, saying "my power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth," forgetting Who giveth the power to get; something, without which an abundance of the necessities for the support of physical life, and of the good things for its enjoyment, is almost sure to be misused or abused, and temperance, sobriety, and self-control degenerate into riotous living and excess, "the things which should have been for men's wealth being unto them an occasion of falling"; something, without which the peace in which men dwell with their neighbours in outward surface life fails to satisfy, because it sheds no calm on the ceaseless strife which man's spirit feels in the depths of his life within; something, without which the strength and vigour of youth and manhood in which the sons of men rejoice, and the winsomeness of girlhood, and the grace and beauty of womanhood which should soften and refine the social and family life, are perverted from the high and holy purposes for which these gifts are given, the strong becoming the tyrant and selfish oppressor of his fellows, and the winsome and beautiful spreading defilement and ruin by her charms. And so he exclaims, not only "happy are the people which are in such a case," but also adds, "blessed are the people which have the Lord for their God."

And we, brethren, to-day who know the history of nations and communities which have played their part on the stage of life, as the various acts in God's great drama of this and past dispensations have passed by; we who watch the history which nations and communities are making in our own life-time, and who appreciate the effects to-day caused by actions and careers of the not remote yesterday; we surely—unless our eyes are blinded that they cannot see, or wilfully closed because we don't want to see—we perceive how that unless there is the fear of God, and a recognition of His Sovereignty, and obedience to His commands, and an attempt and desire, based upon responsibility to Him, to discharge the obligations and duties of life in the various positions, and according to the various opportunities which His providence provides, and in the midst of which He has placed us; having in view the honour and glory of His Holy name, and the welfare of our neighbours, in the widest sense, not each "looking only on his own things" with a view to his own selfish interests, but also "looking on the things of others" with a view to promoting theirs in the great brotherhood of mankind; unless truth and justice, religion and piety, purity and soberness of life, characterise a community, its prosperity will be turned into adversity, its wealth will dwindle away, it will be

* See Speaker's Commentary and Wordsworth's Bible, Vol. XXVIII.—No. 713.

cast down from its proud pre-eminence, and find a place amongst the lowest and least honoured of the world.

Well, brethren, I think of this great community of Manchester to-day; a city famous amongst all the nations of the earth for her pre-eminence in commerce, and her skill in manufacture, sending out to all quarters of the globe her goods, and receiving in return their products or value in exchange; when I think of her municipal and public buildings, second only in this land to those which adorn our great Metropolis; when I remember the advantages which she possesses, for the highest intellectual training in her modern College, and her ancient Grammar School; when I think of the enterprise of her merchants, the skill of her engineers, the wise government of her rulers; when I think of the general prosperity of her citizens, and all the educational and other advantages which they reap from judicious expenditure of public money or private munificence or general charity, in providing for the cultivation of their minds and talents in many and varied schools; for their recreation in her parks, for their health in her baths, for all their ailments and afflictions in her hospitals and asylums; when I ponder over the general prosperity, with here and there a dark feature, as is inevitable in so vast a community, but whose recognition is the first step to their improvement; I ask, Where is any evidence that the general happiness of our City is based upon any sure and abiding foundation? And I think I find some answer in the principle which underlies our proceedings of to-day.

For what means this great Whitsuntide assembly year by year of our sons and daughters, whom we would fain see "grow up as young plants, and be as polished corners" of our civil and domestic fabric, on whom will depend, as the generations pass, the continued prosperity, or otherwise, of this community? Whence come they? Whom do they represent? They come, these thousands* of young men and women and children, gathered from every street and alley and court of this great town, from the abodes of the well-to-do, and from the dwellings of the poorest; and the superintendents and teachers are representatives of every class and grade of which our social life is made up.

And what do they represent? They represent the religious efforts made by the Church alone, independently of other denominations, to gather together on the Lord's Day those who are the Lord's children, and to teach them out of God's Word their relationship to the Father Who made them, and Who so loved them that He gave His only-begotten Son to die for them and redeem them, and Who sends His Holy Spirit to sanctify them with His abiding and abounding power.

The fear and the love of God, and their duty towards Him; their relationship to their fellow-men and their duty towards them; the responsi-

bility of each for the way in which he discharges or neglects his duty; the promises of reward in the future life for obedience to God's commands, and the warnings of condemnation for disobedience; the temporal blessings, even, which righteousness, honesty, temperance, sobriety, purity and truth bring to those who live a godly, righteous, and sober life; if these are the precepts taught on Sunday, as I presume they are, to the thousands gathered in the Sunday Schools of Manchester; and if the privilege and efficacy of prayer for the Holy Spirit's guidance and power to carry these precepts into action in daily life; if the use of all the means of grace which the Father has provided for His children's help is inculcated and enforced; if all these things are done, surely this heaven so widely diffused will leaven the whole mass, and we may have a good hope that God's blessing will continue to rest upon the community, that happiness may abide with a people who are in such a case, that they will be blessed because they "take the Lord for their God."

And for us of the National Church of England, if it be asked "What mean ye by this service" held in the Cathedral of this city, the old Mother Church of this large parish, to-day? I would that the reply might be: "It is to teach our sons and our daughters, and to be a reminder to all, that as from God we receive our command to do the work of life in the various spheres and states into which He calls us, so to His bounty and love we owe the periods of relaxation and rest which refresh us; that our work days and holidays should be lived and spent with a sense of responsibility to Him; that the same Holy Spirit whose aid we need to discharge the tasks of life, is as much needed to guard us from falling into the snares and temptations of its pleasures; that when we bid our young people "rejoice in their youth, and let their heart cheer them in the days of their youth, and walk in the ways of their heart, and in the sight of their eyes," we bid them also "know that for all these things God will bring them into judgment" (Eccl. xi. 9). And so we invite them to the House of God on this first day of a holiday week, that they may, as it were, dedicate their play time and their holidays to Him; that on this great Festival of Whitsuntide, when the Holy Spirit first came down from the Ascended Lord, they may be reminded that their "bodies are the temples of that Holy Ghost which dwelleth in them," that they must keep them pure and holy and undefiled; to pray for them, and bid them pray, that when the holidays are over they may be able to look back upon them as spent in ways, and places, and with companions, the remembrance of which will cause neither sorrow nor remorse; that they may be days of truest happiness and unsullied merry-making, blest to their temporal and eternal welfare, because passed in remembrance that "The Lord is their God."

* 23,000 had previously gathered together in Albert Square.

THE TWO SERVICES.

BY THE REV. HENRY THOMPSON, VICAR OF
ALDEBURGH.

SERMON PREACHED ON THE SEVENTH SUNDAY
AFTER TRINITY, AUGUST 4TH, 1889.

"For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."—ROMANS vi. 23.

SO our epistle ended to-day. We are only too familiar with our Sunday epistles. Familiarity has "trampled them into practical barrenness." And, as for their context, St. Paul's epistles are not the study of most people, nor Scriptures of that nature, but rather the historical parts of the Sacred Book. Yet it would be well to meditate on the epistle sometimes. It has been said the ancient grace of meditation seems to be dying out. A prescribed subject such as we have before us might help us to practise the grace occasionally.

We glance at the passage first to gather its nature in the general, and we find it speaks by comparison or figure. And the reason is given—the infirmity of our flesh. "Our flesh" is our human nature. The term may be used without regard to the sin which has blighted it; "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh"; in our nature, and of course without the sin which does not properly belong to it. But more often it is used with allusion to sin; ours is "sinful flesh." If human nature were only human nature, there would be about it "infirmity" enough to require the use of illustrations. How should the creature understand without all manner of aids the things of his Creator? "Flesh" is too weak and limited. And the case for illustrations is far stronger when it is taken into account that the flesh is impaired by sin, by a corruption inherited through many generations. So the Apostle is directed of the Spirit, not here only, to speak after the manner of men, to compare the Divine to the human, because of our infirmity. This, of course, is one side of our Lord's parables. They were a veil, judiciously imposed on those who had refused the light; but they were also a powerful aid to those who were willing to be taught. Not that we have here a parable strictly. No, it is an extended figure, like the allegories of St. John, rather than the parables of the three other evangelists. The narrative does not stand alone, but the interpretation is woven into it.

The Apostle then chooses for his figure two services. Formerly the Roman Christians were in one service, now they are in quite another. But this is not all. In every service there are three matters, and the Apostle speaks of them all. There is a Master of course. Then there is what he calls the end, the wages, the thing agreed for with the Master. But between these what is too little regarded, the fruit. Every service produces something. The full barn is the result of the

ploughing, sowing, reaping. The clean house is that of the service which sweeps and scrubs and dusts. Beside the terms agreed upon there must be a thing, good or evil, resulting from the toil expended; fruit is left behind when the work is done.

And what are the Masters? Sin, he says, and God. An impressive answer. For we observe there are but two. Men may deny that they serve sin, though they cannot pretend to serve God. There is no middle service. He who just lives to self serves sin. And we observe how distinctly St. Paul lays it down that the two services are never combined. The servant of sin is free in regard to righteousness; the servant to God has been made free from sin. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." It is a fatal delusion to think to do so. And once more we observe drawn out for us the idea of service; it is the presenting of our members to the Master for his use. Bodily limbs and powers, and mental faculties, these we yield, all of us, to the one or the other. Do we belong to sin? The house is dominated by uncleanness and lawlessness; sin defiles and sin rebels. Or to God? In His house righteousness reigns. Our members are so many weapons (v. 13) aiding the unholy or the holy war. Each of these points thus slightly indicated is a subject for the meditation we desire to assist.

The "fruit" next. This too, in each case, is touched with most suggestive hand. First, the past service is searched for it. It would be very striking if we had only that challenge, that question without answer—"What fruit had ye?" To ask and wait for no reply is to say there is no reply. It is a challenge to show anything deserving the good name of fruit; there is nothing worthy the name. But the Apostle speaks of a fruit, if they will call it so. It is undoubted; but then it is "shame." Certainly they are now ashamed of their former service; but is a harvest of shame to be the fruit set down? The truth, however, has already been told; there is worse than fruitlessness, there is worse than shame. The result of presenting their members to lawlessness was lawlessness. Most awful truth and most salutary thought. The penalty of blinding our eyes is judicial blindness, of unfruitfulness it is barrenness, the punishment of sin is the habit of sin. To take one telling example: the punishment of drinking is drunkenness. If there were no other penalty for it than the trembling, suffering frame, the disgrace, the loss of self-respect, the poverty, the moral character unstrung, the chain forged, the habit fixed, it would be an awful penalty indeed. But what of the present service? Its fruit is twice expressed in one blest word—sanctification. We shall return to this. Enough to say that the precious effect of a daily yielding of the members to righteousness is a daily restoration of that image of God which is alone happiness.

We come to note the two ends. They are death and eternal life. Exclusion from the presence of God or admission; destruction from His face, or the fulness of joy in His presence. Note the certainty with which the Apostle speaks; "what fruit?" some may ask, but none can doubt of the end. Note the term "wages"; for like "instruments" it is military. As the due reward of the devil's service death is paid. The law of sin does but work out. God prepared death for none, they choose and earn it. But we do not find any such term used of eternal life. That can be earned by none. How could it be? It was given before the servant had taken one step in the way of righteousness, given him to hold fast, but earned by Another. It was given him that gratitude for the gift might be the motive of a righteousness not begun. Given through Jesus Christ our Lord, whose atonement for the world earned the gift at the hands of Love. And the gift embraces the righteousness, more or less, to which the servant of God attains, so that "when God rewards our works, He crowns His own gifts."

Our meditation should issue in a solemn enquiry before God, to which service we belong. As Christians, we belong to the service of God by position, privilege, and profession. But, if conscience says the members are not servants of righteousness, then our real position has more of disgrace in it than that of the Romans before they were evangelised. For we are runaways, who have left the house of God, and other lords have dominion over us. For such a sad and shameful discovery there is but one remedy, we must seek without delay that throne of grace which alone has mercy to forgive and grace to remove such a sin of backsliding. Happy those who are daily gathering the fruit of an increasing sanctification. By the sore conflict, the manifold temptations, the hard duties, the trying dispensations, by the devotional life secret and public, the Holy Spirit's good work is going on; and every day brings nearer the end of our faith, the salvation of our souls.

THE Rev. Alexander Warham Durdin, rector of Thrextton, died on Sunday. Deceased graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1831, and was ordained in 1835. He was vicar of St. George's, Colegate, Norwich, from 1852 till 1873, and was appointed to the rectory of Thrextton, Norfolk, in 1882.

THE Bishop of Southwell, in presiding recently over a conference at the Town-hall, Buxton, to consider the new Education Code and the relation of the Church to school boards, said he was not in favour of Church schools being given up for a Government system of education without any provision for religious instruction. A resolution proposed by Canon Andrew (Tideswell) and seconded by the Rev. H. T. Dudley (Bradwell), was carried, that the Rural Deans be called to consider whether a fund could not be provided for the sustentation of voluntary schools in poor parishes.

CHRISTIAN DUTIES IN PERILOUS TIMES.

No. III.—SEPARATION FROM THE WORLD.

BY THE REV. E. A. COOKE, VICAR OF ATTLEBOROUGH, NUNEATON; AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE OF S. COLUMBA."

COURSE OF SIX SERMONS PREACHED DURING LENT, 1889, AT ATTLEBOROUGH.

"But this I say, brethren, the time is short; it remaineth, that both they that have wives be, as though they had none; and they that weep as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away."—1 COR. vii. 29-31.

THERE is perhaps no other epistle of the great Apostle in which we obtain so deep a knowledge of the character of the time, or around which so much historic interest hangs, as that to the Corinthians. Writing of its style and matter, Mr. Conybeare (Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*: vol. ii. p. 28) says, "In style this epistle ranks perhaps the foremost of all as to sublimity and earnest and impassioned eloquence. In its contents it is the most diversified of all his epistles: and in proportion to the variety of its topics, is the depth of its interest for ourselves. For by it we are introduced, as it were, behind the scenes of the Apostolic Church, and its minutest features are revealed to us under the light of daily life." In the case of the Church of Corinth we have a sad picture of a Church rent asunder by divisions and party feeling. Here, as in Galatia, there were Judaizing teachers who were sticklers for ceremonial observances, and disclaimed the lawful authority of St. Paul. Opposed to these were the Paul party, who were firm in their adhesion to the Apostle, and whose planting of the first seeds of Christianity in their city they were not likely to forget.

Others followed Peter (or Cephas) as being an immediate disciple of our Lord, and by Him selected as the chief Apostle.

Some (and these a large number) impressed with his eloquence and allegorical expositions of the Jewish Scriptures, followed Apollos, who seems to have exercised a great influence upon the Corinthian Church. Others, boasting of a closer personal intercourse with Christ, pretended they were free from allegiance to any human teacher, and became, what many Christians in the present day are, an extravagant, narrow-minded, and bigoted party. "Some Christians," writes Mr. Conybeare, "were shewing their total want of brotherly love by bringing vexatious actions against their brethren in the heathen courts of law; others were turning even their spiritual gifts which they had received from the Holy Ghost into occasions of vanity and display, not unaccompanied by fanati-

cal delusion; the decent order of Christian worship was disturbed by tumultuary claims of rival ministrations, and even the Holy Communion itself was profaned by scenes of revelry and debauch." Who will say that we have outlived the age when the weighty counsel and warning of the Apostle is no longer needed? We can, as the Corinthians might have done, boast of the magnificence of our temples, our luxury, and our wealth. There is now as then the same moral corruption prevailing in our great centres of commerce; there is now as then the "perplexities of domestic life, the lingering superstitions, the rash speculation, the lawless perversion of Christian liberty;" we witness, as St. Paul did in his day, the strife of theological factions, the party names, the sectarian animosities; we see the Paul party, the Cephas party, the Apollos party, the Christ party; we see men assuming the office of teachers, and boasting of their prophetic knowledge like Theudas and Judas of Galilee (Acts v.), uncalled, unsent men, of whom the Lord might say, "I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied."

Having received intelligence, by the household of Chloe, of the scandals and abuses which were disgracing the Corinthian Church, and in answer to special enquiries about doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline, the Apostle at once enters into the whole question. Whilst replying to the enquiries as to the expediency of marriage (to which the chapter before us is devoted) he would fain lead their thoughts from those transitory interests in which the world was entangling them to that eternal state where they neither marry nor are given in marriage. Keeping in view the shortness of time and the transitoriness of those things which to the Corinthians seemed so satisfying and settled, he points out to them the frame of mind which times of persecution especially require. Time is so short and fashions so transient, those who have wives must be as though they had them not; that is, they were to be prepared at any moment and at any cost to separate from every affection that would stand in the way of their allegiance to God.

Mourners were to rise above all their trials and spiritual wants by the thought that, having hope in Christ, "sorrow might endure for a night but joy would come in the morning." Those that rejoice are to be prepared to resign all earthly joy, pleasure, gratification, and to live in the prospect of that "fulness of joy and pleasure for evermore" at God's right hand.

Temporal objects, such as buying and selling, are to be used by the Christian so as not to have his mind fixed upon them, for all worldly possessions are transitory and are only to be viewed in relation to those eternal possessions which are undefiled, incorruptible, and pass not away.

Now, the warning of the Apostle contained in our text, whilst having special reference to the time or which it was written, need not stop there, for

the moral corruption of such cities as London and Paris is identical with that of Corinth, and the degrading tendency of attachment to the world is as great now as then—nay, there is even more danger in these days of our fidelity being shaken by prevailing abuses, and hence greater cause for separating ourselves from a world which lieth in wickedness.

But what are we to understand by "separation from the world"? I confess the subject is a difficult and delicate one, because in one sense we cannot separate from a world in which our lot is cast, nor is it easy to draw a hard and fast rule as to where the world becomes morally objectionable. The word "world," of which we are in the habit of speaking as if it were the only one, occurs not less than 197 times in the Bible, having different meanings and used in various senses.

The word in the Hebrew for "world" is *Thebal*, in the Greek language *Cosmos*, and in both cases is primarily used in reference to the whole universe or *material* world, comprehending heaven, earth, sea, and created things generally; and sometimes designating the beings dwelling on the earth (see St. Matt. v. 14; John i. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 9). It is hyperbolically used by John the Baptist when he says, "the world knew Him not." Our Lord Himself said, "The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth." And it is said of Him, "The world has gone after Him." Sometimes it is used with regard to God's believing people who are taken from among Jews and Gentiles, and who do not participate in the pleasures of the world. Then, again, we frequently speak of the world in relation to men's minds and social connections.

Man has been called a Microcosm, which means a *little* world in himself. There is the military world, the mercantile world, the musical world, the clerical world, the Dissenting world, the world of law, the agricultural world, the world of science, and so on.

But the world from which we are to separate is that world of darkness and ignorance which is out of harmony with God's mind and purpose. We are to "come out and be separate" from those worldlings who are opposed to Christ's disciples, from men whose only thought and conversation is about the world's gains, pleasures, and opinions. That world of which St. John speaks in his first Epistle: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not of the Father, but is of the world;" and he gives an additional reason why it should not be loved, "for the world is passing away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." And St. Paul says (Rom. xii. 2), "Be not conformed to this world" (καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ), that is, we are not to assume a form, or shape or fashion our lives according to the external habits

of the world, but, on the contrary, "be transformed" (*μεταμορφωσθε*), *metamorphosed*, altered, or spiritually changed. And this transformation must be brought about by a real inward change, "by the renewing of the mind," through the power of the Holy Spirit.

But, you may say, must we then withdraw from the world? Not so, for by absolute withdrawal from the world our influence for good would be lost, and our fellow-men would be no better for our existence. As St. Paul says, "No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." Whilst there are certain things in the world from which we are to abstain if we would be Christ's disciples, we must not forget that His Church is in the world, and, like the parable of the net cast into the sea, gathers of every kind, both good and bad. Our Lord recognises this distinction in His own prayer, "I pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world, *but that Thou shouldst keep them from the evil one.*"

The "strong man armed," even Satan, must be dispossessed by a "stronger," who shall come upon the evil one and overcome him. It is in accordance with this that St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 9, 10) lays it down as an intelligible rule of life. "I wrote unto you in my epistle not to keep company with fornicators: not that you should utterly forego all intercourse with the men of this world who may be fornicators, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But my meaning was, that you should not keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one, no, not to eat." In the words of the text we are to use this world as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away. The language here used by St. Paul is a metaphor taken from the stage. The actor assumes a part, appears for a little time, "struts his hour upon the stage, and then is no more seen." Like the figure in a phantasmagoria, or the flitting shadows in Plato's Cavern, the interest in the fashion of the world is only maintained by perpetual change. But why are we told not to love the world, or the things that are in the world? how are we to separate ourselves from a world which lieth in wickedness, and how may we hope to be delivered from the love of the world? Well, the answer to the first question is supplied in the text: "The time is short"; all fashion—outward show—is transitory, and it is only for a short time we can have anything to do with it. Viewed in the light of Jehovah's unchangeable eternity, our life is a mere shadow, which appears for a little time and then vanishes away. The world of fashion will go on, but man must return to the dust as he was, and the spirit to God who gave it. The time is indeed short in which we are to fight the good fight of faith; the time is short,

and in perilous times especially it behoves us to sit loosely to the world's affairs.

Secondly, separation from the world is nothing more or less than fixing our affections on things above, which is the only way they can be drawn from things below, for, has our Lord not said that where our treasure is there will our heart be also? To separate from the world is to cease to love the world by loving God more and more, hence our attachment to the world will grow weaker. It is to forget those things which are behind—every bad habit, every sin, every weight—and look forth unto those things which are before, pressing towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Lastly, how may we hope to be delivered from the love of the world? This is of all questions the most important; and one which at once strikes at the root of the subject before us.

Faith is the only agency whereby we may overcome or be delivered from the world: and the object of that faith is Jesus Who has overcome all things. But it must be the renewed man, or the birth which is of God in the form of faith that overcometh the world. As St. John says (1 Epis. v. 4). "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even our faith.*" My brethren, let us see that this faith is a living, active thing, showing itself in deeds of love and kindness, always remembering to use the world as not abusing it, that things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. And may He enable us so to know Him whom truly to know is life eternal, that, being our Ruler and Guide, we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal. Grant this, O heavenly Father for Jesus Christ's sake our Lord. Amen.

THE Bishop of Peterborough and the Earl of Mulgrave have gone on a six weeks' visit to Ireland.

THE first diocesan conference under the presidency of the present Bishop of St. Asaph is arranged to be held at Rhyl on September 17 and 18.

THE Dean and Chapter of Llandaff intend to have a Welsh service on October 1st in Llandaff Cathedral in connection with the Church Congress in Cardiff. The Bishop of St. Asaph has consented to preach the sermon in Welsh.

THE London correspondent of the *Birmingham Post* says that Mr. Edward Terry has been invited by the secretary of the Church Congress to read a paper at the October gathering on "The Amusements of the People." Although the journey to Cardiff will involve the closing of his theatre, Mr. Terry has decided to accept the invitation.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary
 Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR
 THE
 Voice,
 Throat,
 Chest,
 and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illus-
 trated Pamphlet with copies of Thou-
 sands of Testimonials
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 1889.

COMPREHENSION No. II.

(Communicated.)

WE return to this subject and to the few topics reserved in our first article. It is a duty "to walk about Zion to tell the towers and mark well her bulwarks." Comprehension is very well within limits, but when Sanballat and Tobiah would have joined the Jews in building, the prophets refused their aid. So there must be a limit to comprehension. Some lines of demarcation still remain to be followed out.

The first I will take is Absolution. This requires to be "marked and traced round about." Some say that a layman can pronounce this as well as a priest. What, then, meant our Lord's solemn commission to His Apostles, when He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins, etc.?" The priest has a power which no layman has. What is this? Whilst one wing of the Church makes nothing of the absolving power, the other confines it to the private act of the priest, after hearing compulsory confession and questionings, *à la* "Deus," and "the Priest in Absolution." We are now gravely told that the public absolutions in the services mean nothing, and that they may as well be pronounced by a deacon as by a priest. Now let us state the middle ground between these two extremes. A priest alone has an absolution to pronounce, but what is its effect? There is no obligation to auricular confession, nor any authority for questionings *à la* Liguori, Deus, etc. All the effect of absolution is to assure the sincere penitent that he has that pardon, of which he needlessly doubts. The priest has power in our Lord's name to assure the doubting, but sincere.

He speaks, as it were, sacramental words; but no one needs them but the doubting, and they change not his state, only his opinion thereof. Leaving this bulwark, which stands out boldly between rival foes outside and inside too, we come now to prayers for the dead and Eucharist.

For prayers for the dead we have no Scripture authority, much less for Eucharist. Natural religion, indeed, may prompt us not to cease our intercessions when the soul has departed. We may be benefited, and we may innocently pray; but there is no authority in the Bible. Of course, if friends will receive the Holy Communion privately beside the dead body, there can be no objection. That it can benefit the deceased is a groundless idea. If anyone thinks that our Lord's material Body is then present and offered for any purpose, this is directly contrary to the Prayer Book, and to the Bible too. This notion cannot be comprehended within our Reformed Creed.

We have one more of our bulwarks to be surveyed. We admit no orders but Episcopalian. We re-ordain any coming with any other. This decides the point. In the same way we perform the marriage ceremony only over those who have not had it as yet. The mere performance proves that we hold it necessary, and that nothing preceding can supply its place. We may meet on platforms members of other religious bodies; but we need not, by so doing, recognise a variety of churches, or a variety of powers for conveying orders. There is a canon of the English Church, as there was one of the Irish, excommunicating anyone who asserts that there is more than one body in the country rightly claiming to be a Church. This is the last of the towers and bulwarks of our Church that we feel bound to include in our enumeration. Comprehension is very well, but it must not include within the walls of the Church any doctrine, or body, which by the dictum of God is excluded. Some seem to think that they have a power of "comprehending" bodies or individuals by their own volition. But they intrude upon God's power. He draws the lines. None can change them, or pass them over. But all, without His lines, we leave to Him. He can save those excluded by His ordinary rules. All we have to do is to explain those rules, and tell people that it is their duty to be comprehended within their limits.

THE *Cambria Daily Leader* says that an anonymous donor has given £10,000 towards the establishment of a new bishopric in South Wales, conditional on the head-quarters of the new see being at Swansea.

THE Bishop of Winchester will be absent from Farnham Castle for a few weeks, and the Bishop of Guildford is abroad. All letters requiring attention should be sent to his lordship's secretary, Mr. H. W. Lee, 1, the Sanctuary, Westminster, or to the Archdeacons of Surrey and the Isle of Wight.

—
"ROBERT ELSMERE."
—

BY THE REV. W. S. GREEN, M.A., RECTOR OF
CARRIGALINE, COUNTY CORK, AND AUTHOR
OF "THE HIGH ALPS OF NEW ZEALAND."

—

THE chief importance of this book depends, I suppose, on the fact that the authoress has succeeded most signally in bringing the destructive criticism of our own day before the minds of the vast multitude of persons, whose reading consists chiefly in what is popular, who for the most part believe in Christianity because they see no reason for disbelieving it, and though they have heard about such arguments as are contained in this book, they have never been in the least tempted to seek them out, on account of their being usually made up in a form not suitable to their minds. Here is a book where the strongest feelings of the human heart are made to play their part so well, that we cannot fail to be attracted and led on till, before we well know where we are, we are in deep sympathy with the hero in his trials, and experience a new feeling with regard to Christianity and the foundations on which it rests. This feeling is not agreeable; still it holds its ground, and bad arguments against the new position only strengthen that position and make return to our former peace impossible.

I read "Robert Elsmere" for the first time while crossing the prairies of the Great North West, and since then I have met many who have experienced the feelings with regard to it and to Christianity, such as I have described. I do not intend to criticise the whole book, I shall only touch on the character of the hero, and on those anti-Christian arguments by which it was affected. Robert Elsmere was a good, honest, straightforward clergyman, full of energy and enthusiasm, learned in most of those things which an ordinarily studious man picks up in college, but narrow-minded, and in this respect more womanish than his wife Catherine. The grasp of the infinite beyond human ken, which would lead a man to feel that as there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy, he had better go cautiously when he undertakes to throw overboard a system wrapt up in the heart's affections of some of the best people the world has seen, seems to be completely ignored.

The Apostle was a step beyond the philosopher who would bind us down to scientific definitions when he expressed the divine life to be a walking as "seeing him who is invisible." This narrowly misses being a mere paradox; but that reality which saves it, intangible, undefinable something, intuitive faculty we may call it, which passes by argument miserably fails, certainly is not given its due force, in the character of Robert Elsmere. Suppose that I saw to-morrow that the historical evidence for Christian miracles was worthless; suppose that, as some modern writers insist, I came to see that the character of Jesus of Nazareth was very far from a perfect ideal. Even then I would hesitate to alter my teaching of Christianity if I was a teacher of it, until some other Gospel of surpassing excellence were presented me. I would say there is nothing perfect in this world; even the best guide my Creator has given to me is imperfect. In this He is in keeping with all else I know: but I would still trust that when "that which is perfect is come then that which is in

part shall be done away," and not till then. And I would hold to Christ as the beacon light in a stormy world, until daylight or something better should break on the scene. I do see fearful gaps in those Christian evidences which satisfied the last generation, but I see nothing better than Christianity in the world outside; and Agnosticism is an impossible position, however we look at it. In these remarks I have tried to place myself in the position in which Napoleon I. is said to have answered the philosophers of his day: "Christianity may be all wrong, but I intend to stick to it till you can give me something better." It was silly for Robert Elsmere to be led from Christianity by a mere will-o'-the-wisp.

With regard to the anti-Christian argument itself, it is thus stated in the author's words, the supernatural being, of course, the chief stumbling-block. "We may quote a few fragmentary utterances taken almost at random from the long wrestle of the two men for the sake of indicating the main lines of a bitter after-struggle. Testimony, like every other human product, has *developed*. Man's powers of apprehending and recording what he sees and hears have grown from less to more, from weaker to stronger." . . . After describing some of the steps by which this conclusion is reached, the authoress puts the following words into the squire's mouth:—"In the first place, I shall find present in the age which saw the birth of Christianity, as in so many other ages, a universal preconception in favour of miracle—that is to say, of deviations from the common norm of experience, governing the work of *all* men of *all* schools. Very well, allow for it then. Read the testimony of the period in the light of it. Be prepared for the inevitable differences between it and the testimony of your own day. The witness of the time is not true, nor in the strict sense false. It is merely incompetent, half-trained, pre-scientific, but all through perfectly natural. The wonder would have been to have had a life of Christ without miracles. The air teems with them. The East is full of Messiahs. Even a Tacitus is superstitious, even a Vespasian works miracles, even a Nero cannot die, but fifty years after his death is still looked for as the inaugurator of a millennium of horror. The Resurrection is partly invented, partly imagined, partly ideally true—in any case wholly intelligible and natural, as a product of the age, when once you have the key of that age."

The preconceptions which have definite historical origin in the pre-Christian literature of the Jews are next discussed, and Elsmere's only answer is this: "I will not fight you any more, Mr. Wendover, he said, with his moved flashing look; I am perfectly conscious that my own mental experience of the last two years has made it necessary to re-examine some of those intellectual foundations of faith. But as to the faith itself, that is its own witness. It does not depend, after all, upon anything external, but upon the living voice of the Eternal in the soul of man!" There is silence for a while, and then the squire, with a faint glimmer of sarcasm, congratulates Elsmere on so easily getting rid of the awkward conclusions he is pressed into. "Everything," he says, "can be got out of in this world."

Mr. Gladstone's comment on this in his able article on "Robert Elsmere," in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1888, is that it is spoken of as a struggle, yet it is all one-sided. "In the great duel between the old faith and the new, as it is fought in Robert Elsmere, there is a great inequality in the distribution of

arms. Reasoning is the weapon of the new scheme, emotion the sole resource of the old."

The arguments, however, cannot be lightly dismissed, for they have real weight, and as opinions on the questions involved are at present in a state of ferment, it is not easy to see what will be the final decision of an epoch of religious controversy which is now but in its dawn. The generation now gone by has seen a marvellous development of physical science, the world before never witnessed anything like it. The generation coming on will see, if I mistake not, something equally remarkable in social and religious change. It is in this direction that we see the greatest tension at present.

Hume's great argument "that it is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true but not contrary to experience that testimony should be false," is, no doubt, the essence of all anti-supernatural arguments. Paley was supposed to have answered him by finding a fallacy in this argument, by showing that there was no "contradictory" experience. The testimony exists and has to be dealt with. Paley speaks of it in this way: "The existence of the testimony is a phenomenon; the truth of the fact solves the phenomenon. If we reject this solution, we ought to have some other to rest in; and none, even by our adversaries, can be admitted, which is not inconsistent with the principles that regulate human affairs and human conduct at present."

We may now ask—Has modern criticism effected the argument of Hume or the answer of Paley in any way? The answer is yes, for it has found a solution for the phenomenon of the testimony in the doctrine of development. Science has established the historical faithfulness of the writers in the broad outline of the events they narrate, but, at the same time, modern criticism has undertaken to show that, without any intention to deceive, these same writers were just the very kind of people to believe supernatural manifestations without any sufficient grounds, and that there is no difference in the way in which St. Paul believed in miracles in his day, St. Augustine those which occurred in his day, and a great many more honest men whose position with reference to such events it is difficult for us to understand. But we should be quite wrong in calling them false or ignorant. They were the natural product of the times.

I can imagine a book being written on the same lines as Robert Elsmere, in which the other arguments which he omits to bring up, or of which he was ignorant, should be so dressed that the infidel might become a Christian. It is not likely such a book will be written, because the spirit of the age is travelling in the other direction at present.

GLADSTONE'S CRITIQUE.

Mr. Gladstone, showing a distinct grasp of the great features of the book, goes on to examine and refute the arguments which shook Robert Elsmere's faith to its foundation, and says much which is most valuable. It is, however, hard to believe that some of the arguments used could convince himself, *e.g.*, in commenting on the "universal preconception" for miracles existing at the birth of Christianity "governing all men of all schools," he says that the effect of the philosophies of the day was altogether opposed to the miraculous, be it so; but what he acknowledges in another place seems to contradict his own argument, for we read that not only were the Jews filled with preconception for the miraculous, but "the super-

natural was interwoven with the entire fabric of the religion of the Roman State which, if weak or effete as a religious discipline, was of extraordinary power as a social institution."* Mr. Gladstone's next point is that Christianity, as represented by the Nicene Creed, has held its head unscathed above the storms of the Middle Ages, above periods of great reformations where the deepest foundations were shaken, and the periods of history when doubt was rampant. "These great discussions accepted the decisions of the early councils as closed at Chalcedon on all points touching the supernatural in the person of Jesus Christ. And may we not trust that the discussions of to-day are not more terrible or likely to shake the great fortress and citadel of Christianity, the Divinity of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ?" These arguments are supposed to be those which would have saved Robert Elsmere had he realised them. Supposing he had advanced them, may we not hear the squire's harsh tones saying, "No doubt the miraculous in Christianity survived the science of the thirteenth century. But you must remember that miraculous events were then supposed to be quite common; witchcraft and portents were rife, no inherent improbability to the miraculous could have possibly been felt. The science of the nineteenth century is of entirely another hue, such a search for truth for its own sake never existed before, never before was such an insight gained into the hidden workings of nature, never before was the human mind led to recognise the grandeur of the inviolable laws of nature. With such a belief suddenly revealed to us as this, miracles seem sacrilege; people in the childhood of the world believed in them, and through their beliefs alone would it be possible for advance in thought to take place. We incline to the belief that nothing of the sort ever occurred. We are ready, of course, to accept them as fact if satisfactory evidence is forthcoming, but though ancient historians often prove most reliable for ordinary facts concerning their own day, we look upon the ancients as essentially incompetent to judge and give evidence on subjects like this."

Three main considerations may be looked upon as suggested by the book under our view and by what I have said: 1st. What answer might Robert Elsmere have given to the arguments of which he seems to have felt the full force; 2nd. What are apparently the present results of destructive criticism which any one of us may be called to face; 3rd. How far is it well to allow our emotions to affirm the truth of what our reason has ceased to acknowledge to be true or certain? In the first place, taking up an argument used by the late Archbishop Tait in an address, entitled "The Church of the Future," I think Elsmere may have said to the squire—Do you mean to say that you think the world is going to do without religion altogether? If the squire answered "yes" Robert Elsmere might well have retorted that such a conclusion was contradicted by all history and experience. If he answered "no," the question would certainly follow. How can religion exist without reference to the supernatural, without God above and before nature, and creation the stupendous miracle of all? I don't

* Even if the philosophers were ready to banish all thought of the supernatural from their beliefs, the world was by no means ready for such an abolition. And when the pendulum of thought had been forced to its utmost away from the miraculous, it was all the more ready to swing back on the first opportunity, and that opportunity seems to have been provided by Christianity.

ee any easy road out of the dilemma. Supernatural religion may, however, be possible, and yet orthodox Christianity be much astray in its exclusive claims. What has recent criticism to say on the subject?

Orthodox Christianity is in its main doctrines, *and in the foundation of them* pledged to the miraculous, I refer especially to the foundation of them, namely, the Bible: for the first axiom in all recent historical criticism of the sacred books is that prophecy or foreknowledge of events is impossible, and when events are referred to as future, the date of the book is immediately removed from the period claimed for its writing to one subsequent to the events referred to. In this way the Pentateuch instead of being written in the time of Moses is moved in whole or in part to the time of Josiah or later. Daniel to one posterior to Alexander the Great. The Gospels to after the destruction of Jerusalem, and with the exception of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Galatians, 1st and 2nd Corinthians, 1st Thessalonians, and Philemon, all the rest of the writings of the Apostle to the Gentiles move on to the second century. Mrs. Humphrey Ward, in her article in the *Nineteenth Century* entitled "The new Reformation," says that Phleiderer represents the present stage of this kind of criticism. I happen to have his volumes on St. Paul, so the above may be considered fairly up to date, and his main conclusions differ but little from his predecessors. The resurrection of our Lord, as also His appearance to St. Paul, are taken as important facts in the beginning of Christianity, but the appearances were subjective rather than objective. Such a distinction was unsuspected by the writers and in no way influenced their belief, which *belief* was the important fact for them and for us.

If this kind of criticism were accepted, the general result would, I think, be, not to dethrone revealed religion, as the tendency of other writings seems to be, but to widen its foundation in the world, and reduce the special claims of Christianity nearer to the level of Buddhism and other great religions whose beginnings rest on somewhat similar grounds, but are equally open to criticism in detail. This I know is the attitude at present held by many thoughtful men in England and the East.

I come now to the final question I have proposed. How far is it well to allow our emotions to affirm the truth of what our reason has ceased to acknowledge to be certain? It is easy to say that it is better to let well alone, and what was good enough for Martin Luther or Dr. Salmon is good enough for me, this too has the advantage of looking like great humility. Religion has constantly taken this course in the world's history, perhaps wisely. The saint says: "I feel, it is true, that is enough for me." It would be better, of course, if what the saint felt to be true should coincide with what the honest science of his time acknowledged to be possible. The competition between these sources of belief can be only apparent, not real, for I hold that God speaks to us through three channels represented by the three aspects of the Trinity, 1st, In what for a better word we call external nature; 2nd, In his written word; and 3rd in the emotions of the human heart. Sometimes when one of these seems to respond uncertainly, the others coincide, when all converge to a focus, that point on which they meet seems the most certain of all.

I believe, then, that Christianity in its broad outline as it exists to-day gives an explanation of some of the darkest phenomena of nature, its pain and its turmoil; it meets the cravings of the human heart in its highest

and purest aspirations, and whatever clouds hang around its origin, it has a positive claim to supernatural revelations, and its advent marks an epoch of supreme importance in the world's history. Speaking of critics who, in upsetting beliefs in supposed historical facts think that they have disposed of them, Carlyle says. "Wilt thou help us to embody the Divine Spirit of that religion in a new Mythos, in a new vehicle and vesture, that our souls, otherwise too like perishing, may live? What! thou hast no faculty of this kind; only a torch for burning, no hammer for building? Take our thanks, then, and—thyselves away." Religion seems to me then to claim for its stability the threefold base, nature, revelation, and emotion, exaggerate one point or ignore it, and the superstructure is rickety in the extreme. The characters brought into play in the book under consideration, one and all, in one way or another illustrate this conclusion.

THREE TEXTS COMMONLY MISAPPREHENDED.

"Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"—GENESIS xviii. 25.

"Not unto us, O Lord, but unto Thy Name give glory."—PSALM cxv. 1.

And ST. JOHN i. 9.

THE first is frequently cited as if it insisted that whatever the Judge might do must be right *because* He did it. However true this may be, it is *not* how Abraham put it. *His* thought was, that whatever is right, *that* the Judge of all the earth would be sure to do, because right it was. For look at his argument: "That be far from Thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked; and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from Thee, shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Abraham is very bold, and is appealing from the mere Person and Power of the Almighty Judge to those eternal immanent principles of right which Himself has implanted in the human breast.

The second is commonly quoted as if it were the deprecation inspired by humility, "*Non nobis, Domine.*" But the deprecation is far deeper. The whole argument and plea is that which is so often met with in the Old Testament, that God is moved to spare a guilty people, not as they deserve, but for the sake of His own Name. See instances in the plea of Moses, Numb. xiv. 13-19; Deut. ix. 26-28. More explicitly, Josh. vii. 7-9; Psalm cvi. 7, 8; Ezek. xx. 8, 9; 13, 14; 21, 22; xxxvi. 21, 22, etc. This fits into the context, *i.e.*, the question which in this Psalm follows: "Wherefore should they say among the heathen, Where is now their God?" If God cast away His people, the heathen might glory over *Him*. But this is a consideration not at all *apropos* of the commonplace, "To God be all the glory, not to us." Take in also the words, "For Thy loving-kindness and for Thy truth's sake." God's truth and loving-kindness, His mercy and truth, are at the two poles of His great Name, His merciful promise or promise of mercy to the undeserving, and His truth in its performance. Where the credit of God's Name, *if because* the suppliant *was* undeserving, this mercy is not shown, this truth not exhibited. The abbreviation or symbol of this plea is, "For Thy Name's sake," of which the Christian form is, "For Christ's sake," expanded once and again in the Prayer Book into, "For the honour of Jesus Christ."

As to the third text, the expression to "Come into the world" is used six times in the New Testament, five times in St. John; and its equivalents, to "be sent" or "brought" into the world three times, twice in St. John; the references being, St. John ix. 39; xii. 46; xvi. 28; xviii. 37; 1 Tim. i. 15; and St. John x. 35; 1 John iv. 9; Heb. i. 6; eight times indubitably of the Lord Jesus Christ, indicating that pre-existence which He alone hath. Strange if in i. 9 only it refer to mortal man, never elsewhere said to have come into the world, but simply to have been born. *Men* are "born into the world"; Christ alone "came into it." The R. V., after Professor Westcott *in loco*, has here the right rendering in its text, though it again misses it in the marginal alternative.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I only ask permission to make a few remarks at a time, on some points, touched by Mr. Donaldson.

It is my conviction that the old theology misconceives the purpose of the Grand Scheme of Redemption, which is universal and not partial. I believe it embraces all the intelligent creation, and not merely Adam's race. So I understand the 1st of Colossians, the 1st of Ephesians, the fifteenth of the 1st of Corinthians, and numerous other parts of the Sacred Volume. I wish to point out that the devil is not an independent power, almost equal to the Deity, as some good people seem to represent. He is a creature of God, whose existence would cease, if not upheld by Divine energy.

I beg to quote a passage in relation to fire as connected with correction and purification. 1 Cor. iii. 15: "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

"What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul." I may conceive a man having rule over the earth and every material enjoyment during a long life. I may conceive a protracted period of pain and misery in the spiritual world, which greatly outbalances the previous fleshy enjoyments. It does not follow that ultimate recovery is impossible.

J. B.

Canonbury, 10th August, 1889.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

SIR,—The PULPIT of July 27 having only just reached me, I thank your correspondent for having noticed me in a fair spirit. At the same time I venture to call attention to some points in his letter on which I cannot agree with him. If I read his argument aright, he takes it that there is "no form of Church Government prescribed in Scripture," and the *only* other standing ground left is, whether it is "expedient." This is going faster and further than I can go. There may be things in Scripture either to be read therein, or else proved thereby, the former to be held most clearly and constantly, the latter with sufficient

plainness to call for a very respectful consideration and practical assent. Thus, for instance, "from the times of the Apostles" includes those times, as is evident from "the Angels of the seven Churches." So, the aforesaid argument founded on an "imperfect division" has really no place, when St. John has left us the threefold ministry. This intimation is of itself enough. On this the Church stands firmly, but not vain-gloriously or uncharitably. Again, as to the assertion that "the bishop is a priest after his consecration, the priest is no longer a deacon," May I note that in Ephesians iii. verse. 7. Paul calls himself "a deacon," translated "minister" in A. V. I trust that this subject may be discussed further in a thoughtful and kindly spirit.

J. D.

10th August, 1889.

THE IRISH CHURCH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—Canon Crosthwaite, in the PULPIT of the 3rd inst., has stated quite clearly what he means by the charge which he has brought against the orthodoxy of the Church of Ireland. The facts, stated more fully, are these:—Shortly after the Disestablishing Act had restored self-government to the Church of Ireland, the General Synod, which is the Parliament of the Church, appointed a Committee, called the Revision Committee, to consider and recommend what alterations should be made in the Prayer Book. This Committee made an elaborate report, recommending many changes, among which was that in the public reading of the (erroneously so-called) Athanasian Creed, the (usually and rightly so-called) damnable clauses should be omitted. This passed into law by the necessary majority of two-thirds of both clergy and laity voting separately, and the consent of a majority of the bishops. But in the following year the statute on the subject was repealed, and it was enacted instead that the Athanasian Creed should not form part of the service of the Church at all. I voted in the majority on both occasions.

The Athanasian Creed remains in the Prayer Book, but without any rubric prefixed or affixed, and the declaration in the eighth Article, that it ought "thoroughly to be received and believed," remains untouched.

I was present at most of the debates on the subject, and I regard the statement of an understanding between the Evangelical and the Broad Church parties—each giving something up to please the other—as totally without foundation.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 6th August, 1889.

EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION.

SIR,—“C.C., V.-G.” would hardly write as he does, if he were better informed on this point, and (let me add) if he were less prosaic. We use this phrase to emphasise the perpetual reality of Christ's Presence; we mean that in the Blessed Sacrament He still clothes Himself in material elements, thereby to assure us of His Real Presence and to impart His grace. The elements which His Spirit quickens we call His Flesh and Blood, as He Himself did. This is the Incarnation extended to all time. The phrase may

be novel, but not the idea ; that we have from the Master.

A. G. S.

SIR,—The expression, the extension of our Lord's Incarnation, as applied to the Sacraments, is, I think, awkward, while by no means indefensible. It is through Christ having assumed human flesh that He is enabled to become, as He is, the head of redeemed mankind ; to become also, the Body of His Church. It is through the Sacrament of baptism that men enter into the redemption covenant with God, as is said in 1 Cor. xii. 13, "By one Spirit are we all baptised into one body." Thus baptism, in which active spiritual life is initiated, is founded on the Incarnation ; the possibility of our being joint heirs with Christ depending on His humanity, and baptism being the means through which that joint heirship is conferred. The Sacrament of the Eucharist is the spiritual partaking of Christ's Body and Blood, whereby the souls of His faithful people are fed. It derives its whole meaning and effects from His Incarnation, for without that He could not have given His flesh for the life of the world. The greater part of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel is an exposition of this. But the Sacraments, both that in which life begins, and that in which it is maintained and nourished, are not the sources of that life. The Incarnation is its source ; the Sacraments are the vehicles through which life reaches, or is extended to us.

The saying "Sacraments are the extensions of the Incarnation" is accordingly not unreasonable, while its meaning is not so evident as to make its employment in general very advisable. I believe that the originator of the saying was one of the Wilberforces, who afterwards became a Romanist. It is quite likely that he meant or intended something beyond the above, although I do not understand how the materialistic notion of the Eucharist, entertained by Romanists and those who think like them, is capable of being applied, by imitation or otherwise, to the other Sacrament. People of that kind seem to me to answer the question, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" in the very opposite way from that in which our Lord's audience answered it. Those Jews apparently concluded that what He told them was impossible. Romanists think it possible, but answer the Jews' question by adopting an impossible supposition.

B.

THE *Gloucestershire Chronicle* says that the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has gone to Bel Alp, his usual Swiss resort during the summer vacation.

THE Bishop of Bath and Wells, of which diocese (founded A.D. 905) he was consecrated sixty-ninth Bishop on December 21, 1869, having been born on August 20, 1808, celebrated his eighty-first birthday on Tuesday last.

THE Rev. C. H. Hylton-Stewart, who for the past twelve years has been Precentor of Chester Cathedral, has accepted the living of St. James's, New Brighton, of which the Bishop of Chester is the patron. While at Chester Cathedral the Precentor has, says the *Morning Post*, much improved the musical services. In conjunction with Dr. J. C. Bridge, he founded the Triennial Musical Festival. Three festivals have been held at the cathedral, with the Precentor as

honorary secretary, and each has been financially successful.

THE Rev. James Cottingham has intimated his resignation of the benefice of St. Michael, Shotwick, Chester, which he has held for the long period of fifty-eight years. Mr. Cottingham is the oldest beneficed clergyman in the diocese of Chester, and was ordained in 1827.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Anderson, Rev. E. Preston, Rector of SS. Simon and Jude's, Manchester ; Honorary Diocesan Secretary of the Church Emigration Society.
- Bates, Rev. Thomas, formerly of the St. Andrew's Waterside Mission ; Vicar of Caddington, near Luton, Beds.
- Bunt, Rev. Alexander Colvin, Rector of Millbrook and Rural Dean of Southampton ; Rector of Burghclere, Newbery.
- Claridge, Rev. John Thomas Windmill, B.A. ; Rector of Upton Cressett, Bridgnorth.
- Darling, Rev. Thomas Young, Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society ; Rector of Compton Abbas, otherwise West Compton, Dorset.
- Darnell, Rev. Francis Aubrey, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces (fourth class) ; Chaplain to the Forces (third class).
- Gregory, Rev. T., M.A., late Curate of All Saints', Newmarket ; Vicar of Skellingthorpe, Lincolnshire.
- Groome, Rev. William Hubert, M.A., Rector of Monk Soham, Suffolk.
- Hebblethwaite, Rev. Ernest Presgrave, M.A., Vicar of Poundstock, Cornwall.
- Hogarth, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Barton ; Rector of Harston, Leicester.
- Hooper, Rev. George Brereton, M.A., Vicar of Herodsfoot, Cornwall.
- Howson, Rev. J. F., Vicar of Christ Church, Chester.
- Little, Rev. Charles Edward, Vicar of Eglosayle, Cornwall.
- Lockyer, Rev. Edward, Curate of St. Saviour's, Brixton Hill ; Rector of Rodborough, Gloucestershire.
- Lonsdale, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Thornthwaite-with-Braithwaite, near Keswick ; Vicar of Upperby, Carlisle.
- Lutener, Rev. W. Maurice B., B.A., Senior Curate of Bowdon ; Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Crewe.
- Merrick, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Puttenham, Herts ; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Albans.
- Nash, Rev. Alexander, M.A., Rector of Quedgeley ; Vicar of Standish-with-Hardwicke, Gloucestershire.
- Perry, Rev. Edward Mann, Vicar of Mevagissey, Cornwall.
- Price, Rev. H. M. C., Vicar of Northam ; Vicar of Valley End, near Chobham.
- Ransome, Rev. Maurice J., Curate of St. Oswald's, Malpas ; Rector of Croglin, Kirkoswald, Carlisle.
- Roberts, Rev. Charles Manley, B.D., Rector of Brinkley, Cambridgeshire.
- Saulez, Rev. Robert Travers, Vicar of Belchamp St. Paul ; Diocesan Inspector for the Deanery of Yeldham, Diocese of St. Albans.
- Stewart, Rev. C. H. Hylton, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, New Brighton, Cheshire.
- Thompson, Rev. C. J., Vicar of St. John's, Cardiff ; Rural Dean.
- Trafford, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Newland St. Lawrence, Essex.
- Varley, Rev. Frank, M.A., Rector of Greenstead, Colchester.
- Williams, Rev. Henry, Rector of Ashleworth ; Vicar of North Nibley, near Dursley.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Browne, Rev. Thomas Briarly, M.A., T.C.D., for twenty-five years Rector of East Acklam, at the Rectory, East Acklam, York, on the 12th inst.
- Durbin, Rev. Alexander Warham, Rector of Threxton, at Threxton Rectory, Watton, Norfolk, on the 18th inst.
- Paige, Rev. Lewis, M.A., for twenty-one years Rector of Whitfield, at Whitfield Rectory, Northants, on the 12th inst., aged 86.
- Watts, Rev. J. W., M.A., late Vicar of Bicester, at Summer-ville, Ryde, Isle of Wight, on the 14th inst., aged 83.



The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE WORK.

BY THE REV. ALEX. J. HARRISON, B.D., LECTURER OF THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE SOCIETY, VICAR OF LIGHTCLIFFE, HALIFAX.

SUBSTANCE OF A SERMON DELIVERED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON JULY 14TH, 1889.

"Ye shall be witnesses unto me."—ACTS i. 8.

OF the great subject which the text opens to our view I propose to deal with only one part, namely, Christian evidence work. The treatment is under four heads. The first relates to misconceptions; the second to the treatment of sceptical systems; the third to Christian evidences in general; the fourth to the continuous witness of the Church of Christ. A still further limitation must be made. Under each head much that is desirable is omitted to make room for what is indispensable, and much that is indispensable is omitted to make room for what seems in danger of being overlooked or undervalued. Only such points are noticed as experience of our work in the North of England has suggested to me as needing special emphasis, in the case of all come into frequent contact with sceptics.

I. In the first place, our work is to remove misconceptions, of which the following may be regarded as examples. You know the distinction commonly made between mathematical and other kinds of proof, the former being supposed to have the greater certainty. Now, without impugning the value of the first named, a little reflection will show that the distinction has no importance in its bearing on our subject. As a matter of fact there is no mathematical evidence of the existence of anything. For in mathematics we are concerned with quantities, and its function is not to prove the existence of an object, but to determine its amount. Sometimes the statement is that we have no scientific evidence. The idea appears to be that we cannot verify our belief as a physical or chemical theory may be verified, and that therefore we can have no adequate justification of our faith. But verification means the showing or proving true, and this is as really accomplished by the experiments which test the agreement of a statement with accepted truths as by those conducted in the physical or chemical laboratory.

Again, it is occasionally assumed that science consists only of knowledge, and religion only of belief, an assumption which has no warrant whatever,

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 714.

as every scientific man who is also a philosopher will at once admit. Another form of the idea is that what is not an object of the senses is beyond the range of knowledge or of reasonable belief; whereas the more science is studied the more one feels that it, like religion, depends upon things that the eye has not seen, the ear has not heard. Yet another misconception is found in the phrase creation by law. The phrase is ambiguous. It may mean either that creation is according to law or that law creates. The former is, of course, consistent with belief in God, the latter is not. If, however, we examine the expression "law creates," we are forced to the conclusion that no one can seriously mean what the words assert. For law in a scientific sense is but a mode of force, and the assertion commits us to the theory that the mode exists before the force, which is manifestly impossible, unless it exist in mind, as does a purpose before it is carried into effect. A closely related misconception is the notion that there is some necessary opposition between will and law. But is not the "uniformity of law" a scientific counterpart of the theological doctrine of the immutability of God?

In the same connection is to be noticed the mistaken idea that the laws of matter are material laws. Even if this could be said of force (there is less reason for calling it material than there is for calling it spiritual), it cannot be said of its laws, except in the teeth of the evidence. Then there is the extraordinary misconception which regards the ascription of power to the eternal cause as an honour, but the ascription of personality as a dishonour. Yet another strange illusion is the fancy that if we substitute "evolution" for "creation" or "design," it becomes unnecessary to recognise God, whereas evolution as much implies an evolver, as does creation a creator, or design a designer. Perhaps the misconception which needs to be met with the greatest persistence and patience is that half recognition, half violation of the principle of causality which at the same time confesses the Omnipresent Power as the cause of all phenomena—those of life, will, society included—and refuses to admit that a power so described cannot be less than conscious, intelligent, volitional, personal, cannot be less than what Christians mean by the word God. To these examples may be added a difficulty which is not confined to sceptics. Starting with the assumption that "*whatever is is caused*," the question immediately arises, What is the cause of the Divine Existence? Even were we compelled to ask this question, and were doomed to be for ever unable to answer it, that would be no reason for Atheism. Otherwise we should be committed to the destructive principle that we shall believe in nothing for whose existence we are unable to account; in other words, the names not only of God, but also of space, time, matter, motion, force, and even self, would be struck out of our creeds. But the assumption is wrong.

The principle of causality asserts, not that whatever exists, but whatever begins to be is caused. All the evidence takes us to God; there is nothing to take us beyond. We go as far as the evidence goes, and no farther.

2. In the second place, it is a part of our work to find out and to register what there is of good in sceptical systems. It is necessary to bear in mind that hardly any error is all error. We must, therefore, recognise in every case what we find to be true in the ideas of opponents. My own experience convinces me that when a sincere sceptic finds satisfaction in his system of unbelief, the satisfying element is not the scepticism, but the Christianity which, whether he know it or not, is always present in greater or less degree. Indeed, in Positivism, Agnosticism, and the like, there is a great deal of disguised Christianity. But, in any case, we cannot serve Christ by ignoring what is true in the statements of His enemies. Besides this, let me remind you that we are considerably indebted to sceptics. It very commonly happens that, while opponents think they are attacking Christianity itself, their criticism really bears only on some perversion or corruption of Christianity of which, without their aid, we might have been only dimly conscious, or not conscious at all. As this awakened consciousness of wrong is the first step towards its removal, how can we fail to thank those who have helped us to become better Christians? For my own part I think more of the kindness they do than of the destruction they intend. So far, they have succeeded in establishing what they sought to overthrow. For they have cleared the ground of outlying obstructions which were much more hindrances to defence than preventives of attack. But this is only in passing. Our serious concern is to treat the systems of opponents with the respect which is always due to our earnest attempts to grapple with the deeper problems of life, and with that sympathetic justice without which, though we may be keen critics, we cannot be trustworthy judges.

But to do this well we must free ourselves from the tyranny of terms, and examine closely the thing as well as the word. Believing as we do that though there may be many streams, there is only one fountain, of truth, and that every stream, if traced upward, will take us back to the fountain, I hold that as there is something true in every sceptical system, so is there a way from it to Christ. However forbidding its aspect, however threatening its name, in the heart of it you will find a witness for Christ. Take, for example, Agnosticism. This form of scepticism is universally recognised as being the deadliest foe, the inconsistencies of Christians alone excepted, which the Church of God has ever been called upon to encounter. If it be true that we can have no real knowledge of, no reasonable belief in, God, then Christianity is merely a more or less attractive and beautiful dream which the imagination of man has added to the literature of

the world. If, however, we pass from the word to the thing, we have the authority of the greatest living writer on the subject, for saying that we are committed to no such conclusion. Mr. Spencer asserts the Unknowable to exist, and to be rightly believed in as the Absolute, as the Manifested, as the Power, as the Omnipresent, as the Cause, as different from force in its ordinary sense, as not less than personal. To those who are not familiar with Mr. Spencer's writings the last statement will appear so extraordinary, that I think it well to quote his exact words. He says: "Those who espouse this alternative position make the erroneous assumption that the choice is between personality and something lower than personality, whereas the choice is rather between personality and something higher. Is it not just possible that there is a mode of being as much transcending intelligence and will, as these transcend mechanical motion? It is true that we are totally unable to conceive any such higher mode of being. But this is not a reason for questioning its existence. It is rather the reverse." What, then, is all this but another form of the Christian doctrine of the infinity of God, and that our knowledge of Him is apprehension, not comprehension? Is it not also, as far as it goes, a vindication of the principle of faith?

3. It is, in the third place, a part of our work to secure the adaptation of Christian Evidence Literature to the wants of our time. It is well to note that the testimony stored in books must be used to interpret the continuous living witness of the universe, of man and of the Church. The first, of course, in one sense includes the second and third; but we may regard the second as a specialisation of the first, and the third as a specialisation of the second. The first is a perpetual manifestation of Omnipresent Power; the second is a constant suggestion of the spiritual nature of the eternal cause, and reveals, though in some respects dimly, the principles and method of the moral government of the world; the third is the permanent guardian and herald of a revelation which, at the same time that it is special, having a purpose and a function of its own, supplements and completes the manifestation of God in nature and man; it is also the divinely appointed witness for, and channel of, supernatural grace which has never been absent from the world since man had a conscience to realise the guilt, or a heart to feel the oppression of sin. On all these points many great works have been written—works of magnificent strength and beauty. If we have regard to substance rather than form we already possess in the immense wealth of Christian Evidence literature a key to almost every difficulty, an answer to almost every objection.

It must, however, be conceded that the form is important as well as the substance. For, when readers find no recognition of doubt or denial in the specific shapes in which these present them-

selves to-day, they too hastily conclude that the books they meet are, however valuable in themselves, of little use to them. There is a great deal in contemporary speculation which might be answered from the pages of St. Augustine, yet how few even of scholars would think of going to St. Augustine for the purpose. Butler's "Analogy" is so essentially a scientific book, and is, in so many respects, adapted to our present wants that it is in no danger of growing old to our thought or feeling; yet there are comparatively few who perceive with what effect Butler's method may be brought to bear on the controversies of to-day. Paley's "Evidences" cannot indeed be regarded as altogether adapted to present needs; yet there are few recent writers on the subject who are not greatly indebted to the work in question, and the development of the simple truth already named, that evolution as much requires an evolver, as adaptation an adapter, as design a designer, would go far towards rendering Paley one of the most useful of all our apologists.

I would not, however, have you suppose that much has not been already done in answering the most modern forms of scepticism. Indeed, it may be said that up to the present the defence has more than equalled the attack. It would be scarcely possible to find a modern objection that has not been more or less efficiently met by someone; and it is not the least of our obligations to the Christian Evidence Society that it issues from time to time carefully selected lists of Christian Evidence works. But the very multitude of these works constitutes a serious and an increasing difficulty. It would be foolish to expect even a scholar, unless his whole time were devoted to the subject, to possess and to read them all. Our special need is a great constructive intellect, less ambitious to produce original work than to build up, into one vast and harmonious whole, the immense mass of material scattered at present through multitudinous volumes. Or if this be too much to expect from one man, is there not some gifted theological thinker who will do for the philosophy of Christian evidence what Mr. Spencer has done for the philosophy of science?

Yet, valuable almost beyond the power of expression as such a work would be, and complete as are the answers already given in detail to the objections heretofore raised, it is not to any book whatever, large or small, I would refer you for the permanent evidence which the soul needs from day to day, and hour to hour, that God is and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Professors of physical science are never weary of insisting upon the necessity of passing from books to direct contact with nature, and of verifying by experiment what has been taught in theory. It is true, as we have seen, that in theology as in science, there are theories which admit of only of indirect verification; but that which it is

most important to us to know and to believe may be daily tested in the laboratory of life. Communion with God in nature, man and the Church, communion which no special studies must be allowed to break for an instant, affords the vital evidence, without which all the books are but shadows and unsubstantial things. Yet there is one book which, unlike all others (except as these derive their influence from that), has the singular power of enabling us to come at once to the "heart of things," and in very truth to "see the invisible." Reasonably read and rightly interpreted, the one supreme Christian Evidence Book, to which all others are but auxiliaries, is the Bible itself.

4. In the fourth place, it is part of our work to continually remind Christians that it is the living Church which must ever be the chief witness for Christ. It is quite true that the Christianity of the Church has not always been, is not always now, the Christianity of Christ. No one who is familiar with history can deny that offences have been committed, not only by unauthorised individuals, but also by formal representatives of the Church of God. Nor have these been, always, instances of unbridled passion which the merely nominal religion professed was, of course, powerless to check. More than once or twice do we find ecclesiastics, whose personal holiness is beyond suspicion, giving official sanction to what in the light of the Christianity of Christ we can only designate as crimes. Indeed, history affords convincing proof of the extreme folly of saying it does not matter what one believes so long as he is a good man. If men known to be good act on wrong beliefs they become the more dangerous to society on account of their goodness, inasmuch as bad deeds are often more or less accredited by the repute of the doers. If bad deeds were done only by bad men, comparatively little harm would result to the cause of Christ. The wounds which bleed most are those which are inflicted on our Lord in the house of His friends.

Nevertheless, the Church has always been, and always must be, the supreme witness for Christ. Her chief function is to conduct man to Him by whose grace salvation becomes an accomplished fact in the individual members of His Body. Union with Christ, which involves union with His Church, wherever this is possible, is not simply a condition of salvation, it is salvation itself. Without discussing the condition of good men amongst heathen abroad and sceptics at home (for we are not bound to think of the power of Christ as confined to one method), history shows that wherever men have been consciously converted to Christ, it has been through the instrumentality of His Church. The cases are at all events comparatively rare where men have been converted by the Bible alone; but even then it was still through the Church, by to or for whom

the books which constitute the Bible were written, and by whom they have been preserved. She is the authorised guardian and teacher of Divine Revelation; but she is more than this. She is a divinely founded and divinely maintained spiritual society into whose fellowship and life the whole world is to be gathered. It is said that man is the creature of circumstances. Taking the meaning rather than the words, the saying is still only a half truth, for it is just as true that man acts on circumstances as that circumstances act on man. None the less, the half truth is important, and in the Divine constitution of a spiritual society the need not only to create a new life within, but also to surround it with a favourable environment without, is recognised.

But indeed it is impossible to over-estimate the Church of Christ. What is there that we have of value in ethical conception or moral conduct, in doctrinal strength of conviction or spiritual beauty of character, in outward environment of aids or inward rest of heart, that we do not owe to the Church as the agent and instrument of God? With her we are united in the unity of a common origin and in the fellowship of a single purpose. As children to their mother, nay, more, as members to the body, so are we to the Church. Her life blood throbs in every brain and beats in every heart. She is the one institution, organisation, society, life, that has survived with ever growing power and ever renewed adaptation all the chances and changes of time, while around her in all lands, the princes and potentates, the principalities and powers of the world have come and gone, the old order continually yielding to the new. Her aim is lofty as the heavens and broad as the universe. Her rule is deep, as the soul, her provision as wide as its wants. Her strength is of eternity, for she is the kingdom of God upon earth. Yet her glory is the glory of service. Like her Lord she comes not to be ministered unto, but to minister. She exults not that she has overcome empires and humbled kings. She boasts not of the pomp of her ritual or the magnificence of her churches. Her praise is that she keeps open for the world the ways to God, to union with herself in Him, to repentance, and faith and holy life.

This is the special aspect of the Church which needs to be clearly presented to unbelievers, and this can be effectually done only by the purity and nobleness of our lives. If we would win sceptics we must show that we have what they have not and cannot have. Our life must prove that we have a source of strength scepticism can never reach; a source that is in but not of the world, the supernatural grace of God. The conversion of sinners, the holiness of believers, are the best witness the Church of God can bear. But there are still certain hindrances to this perfect testimony of which we should do well to lay to heart. One of these is the absence

of authoritative expositions of the doctrines of inspiration and of future punishment. A right view of the method of Divine Revelation would remove three-fourths of the difficulties which at present stand in the way of the loyal acceptance of the Old Testament. For example, all the controversies about the dates of books leave untouched those who hold that we have in the Jewish nation and Church itself the witness for God, and whether this or that book be proved earlier or later than was once supposed is of comparatively small importance.

Again, those who believe in the evolution of religious life in the chosen people are not in the least surprised to find in the Old Testament phases of feeling and thought which are formally irreconcilable with the teaching of Jesus Christ. For it is obvious that at any stage of evolution the views held or things done must appear very imperfect to those who have reached a higher stage. Indeed, the difficulty in accepting the Old Testament may be said to have been created by Christianity itself. All other sources of illumination "pale their ineffectual fire" in the presence of the Light of the World, and so regarded must appear perfect indeed. But then there is another aspect. The dawn is wan and cold as compared with the sun's noonday glory, but it is a roseate brilliance as compared with the star-lit darkness which flies at its coming. However small the Jewish Revelation may seem when compared with the manifestation of God in the flesh, it was yet a "great light" as compared with the almost unrelieved obscurity which covered the world before its rise.

Once more. The verbal contradictions in the statements of even contemporary teachers, as of Paul and James in reference to justification by faith or by works, or in the doctrine at different times of the same teacher, as where our Lord is represented as saying at one time "I came not to send peace but a sword," and at another, "My peace I give unto you," do not trouble those who understand the nature of language, the impossibility of always using the same words in the same sense, and the necessity to take into account the occasion on which, the circumstances in which, the words were spoken. Nor will the presence of errors in matters of science, or of mistakes into matters of history, or, in short, of any ordinary limitations of knowledge or capacity affect those who remember at once that revelation had a human side, that is to say, revelation was given through imperfect agents—men, using an imperfect instrument—language; and that the choice was not between this and something higher, but between this and no revelation at all. For it is obvious that if revelation was to make men perfect, it must have been given while they were yet imperfect. And if through human agency and language (no other would have been intelligible) it must, in its historic form, have been modified by

the imperfections of its medium, imperfections which, of course, vary with the different stages of development.

All this—much more than this—has been frequently explained; but in the absence of any authoritative statement by the Church, it is always open to opponents to say that the views here expressed are merely more or less interesting private speculations. If it be held that it is undesirable for the Church to attempt to define inspiration (probably definition is impossible), she might at least decisively assert what it is her children ought to believe concerning the general method of Divine revelation, and the inter-relation of the Holy Scriptures and the Church. As matters stand, the attitude of vast numbers is expressed in the hopeless expression, “I do not know what to believe.” I may add, it is no wonder that attack is concentrated on the Old Testament, for so long as the Church furnishes her children with no definite principle of interpretation, it is here that defence is weakest.

The difficulty is even greater in respect to the subject of future punishment. Perhaps no one preaches to-day the horrible conceptions of material fire in which souls are deliberately tortured for the Divine glory; yet I do not know that the Church has ever, by any formal statement, repudiated these conceptions as untrue. Again, it is the State rather than the Church which has decided that, whatever the true view may be, non-belief in the eternity of future punishment is not inconsistent with membership of the Church. A still more important question is our attitude with respect to the destiny of sincere sceptics. More important, because while in all other cases it is held that future punishment, whether everlasting or not, is meted out only to the impenitent sinner, the question here raised touches the very foundations of moral government. Eternal punishment can be defended only on the ground of moral necessity, the guilt of the accused being granted. But, in this case, we have to ask—Is scepticism, when it arises from unavoidable causes, a sin? Probably no one will answer yes. The question then changes into this—Does any such scepticism exist? Does there exist, no matter how rarely, a kind of scepticism that does not, considering the inherited organisation and actual circumstances of the sceptic, involve the guilt of sin? If there does, and if we hold that every sceptic, without exception, will finally and for ever perish, then we virtually assert that punishment may be inflicted for that which is not sin. In doing this we not only excite the wrath, but we also rouse the conscience of the sceptic against ourselves. As far as I know there is absolutely no warrant in Holy Scripture for saying that punishment is ever inflicted except for sin, and the Church of God ought to be exceedingly careful that her creed, at least, should admit

of no interpretation not warranted by the word of God, or by necessary inference therefrom. The misinterpretation of one of the clauses of one of her formularies has probably produced more opposition to the Church of England, and, alas! to her Lord and Master, than all other causes, the evil life of nominal Christians alone excepted, put together. Yet to the present hour there is no authoritative statement in her Prayer Book as to how the clause in question is to be interpreted!

The problem of the heathen occupies a different position, and we have the authority of St. Paul for saying what indeed ought never to have been doubted, that their circumstances will be taken into account in the determination of their individual destiny. Perhaps the greatest hindrance to the frank acceptance of the Apostle's doctrine is expressed in the question one so often hears—Why, then, send out missionaries? The answer is simple and direct. It is only they who have according to their light so lived as to be divinely numbered among the righteous, that are saved, not without Christ, but without the knowledge of Him. But if the righteous be comparatively few even in Christian lands, how small the numbers where Christ has never been proclaimed! And missionaries, like our Lord Himself, go forth “not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.” Yet the Church, as such, gives her children no help on this subject.

I have emphasised the foregoing not because they are more important, but more likely to be forgotten than such hindrances as divisions among Christians, the inconsistencies of believers, want of sympathy with popular movements, and the like. Perhaps nothing can better show the heaven-born and heaven-fed vitality of the Church than the way in which it grows in power and usefulness, notwithstanding faults that would have destroyed any institution not Divine. As to the assaults of external foes, one word may be fairly added. Hundreds of sincere sceptics who, in the enthusiasm of their earlier days, have rejoiced with almost boundless exultation in every modification of doctrinal statement which they succeeded in forcing upon the Church, in every change of attitude which they have compelled her to make towards the scientific questions of the day, must, when increasing age has tempered the passions of youth and cleared and enlarged the range of mental vision, have contemplated with dismay the fact that though they have rendered good service to humanity, that service has resulted not in weakening, but in strengthening the position of the Church. Unconsciously to themselves their spears have turned into pruning-hooks.

In conclusion, I would fain persuade every one in this vast congregation to take some part in the work described. The motives are pity, love, devotion. The ways are suggested by the motives. Pity must not patronise, love must not dissimulate,

devotion must not pretend. Our feeling for the sceptic is a part of the universal passion of pity for all who suffer, but most intense when, as is too often the case, scepticism is the result of sin. It is not with scorn or wrath we ought to speak of those who are separated by positive unbelief from Christ, even though insincerity blend with their scepticism. For if to the common misery of sin there is added the unutterable hopelessness of scepticism, and if the scepticism is deepened to a blacker darkness by the shadow of dishonesty, then surely there is occasion not for a tempest of angry denunciation, but rather for a rush of pitying tears. But let me remind you, my brethren, that pity is as far removed from indifference as it is from scorn. Worse even than anger is the easy good nature that makes light of scepticism. No man can under-estimate the gravity of unbelief without undervaluing the significance of Christianity. He who thinks it of little importance, whether a man is a sceptic or not, thinks it of little importance whether a man is a Christian or not, whereas, rightly viewed, Christianity, if it means anything at all to our souls, means everything. The strong and abiding pity for which I plead recognises the profound peril which surrounds the souls of sceptics as of other men, and seeks with the strength an intense passion always give, not so much to answer the argument as to save the man. You will not think that I despise intellect. Argument there must be, there ought to be, but argument through which distils the dew of kindness, or glows the warmth of sympathy. Logic, but, like that of St. Paul, set on fire of love. And, O my brethren, remember that when the atheist says he is unconscious of God, God is not unconscious of him, and is, perhaps, using us to waken the dormant feeling for and of the Divine, in the atheist's heart. Do not let yourselves be discouraged by the sceptic's assertion that he despises your pity. I do not think he does. What he despises is pretension, patronage, airs of superiority. It is impossible that he should not be touched by your solicitude for his welfare, if that solicitude be real, earnest, constant, and undismayed by his jokes and scoffs, his quick turns and keen retorts, his biting irony or bursts of wrath. These things are not the man, they are but his weapons and his armour. Behind them beats the heart that needs Christ, and that will sooner or later recognise Christ in you by the patient gentleness with which you seek to save.

THE Rev. Edward J. Perry, curate, of St. James's, Clerkenwell, and assistant-master of Merchant Taylors', has been appointed by the Church Missionary Society principal of Trinity College, Kandy, Ceylon, in succession to Dr. Hodges, Bishop-designate of Travancore, and the Rev. J. W. Fall, curate of Walcot, near Bath, has been appointed vice-principal.

CHRISTIAN DUTIES IN PERILOUS TIMES.

No. IV.—EARNESTNESS IN SERVICE.

BY THE REV. E. A. COOKE, VICAR OF ATTLEBOROUGH, NUNEATON; AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE OF S. COLUMBA."

COURSE OF SIX SERMONS PREACHED DURING LENT, 1889, AT ATTLEBOROUGH.

"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord."—1 COR. xv. 58.

THESE words of St. Paul form a practical conclusion to the great chapter which is read in the Prayer Book Office for the Burial of the Dead.

It is one which contains, beyond all others in the New Testament, the plain teaching of the doctrine of the Resurrection, written, no doubt, to meet the speculative doubts and fears of men like Hymenæus and Philetus, who said the Resurrection was past, and explained the language of the Apostles as signifying only the spiritual quickening of a world dead in sin. St. Paul, therefore, exhorts the Corinthian Church of his day to be steadfast and unmoveable in this fundamental article of the faith. He begins the chapter with summing up the evidence by which the doctrine is established against its impugnors; tells them that as Christianity is founded upon history, so also the resurrection of the body is founded upon the fact of Christ's Resurrection (Ps. xvi. 10; Hosea vi. 1, 2; Matt. xii. 40; 1 Cor. xv. 20); that as He died and rose again, so we will rise with new and glorified bodies like unto His Glorious Body; seeing we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in a twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; seeing that to the believer death has lost its sting, and the grave its victory through Him who has made us "more than conquerors;" seeing that God will so gloriously accomplish His work, therefore, my beloved brethren, whatever hardness you may be called upon to endure, whatever trials, temptations, difficulties you may have to encounter, be steadfast and unmoveable in this faith; let nothing draw you away from the simple straightforward course of confessing Christ before men; let no suggestions of others unsettle or stagger you; but, on the contrary, become faithful and zealous, abounding more and more in every good work, forasmuch as your labour is not in vain in the Lord.

"Be ye steadfast." The Greek word *ἐδραιος* here translated "steadfast" is very expressive, and means being settled on a seat with steadiness; and so the Christians of Corinth were to be as decided and settled in their belief of the doctrine of the Resurrection as a person sits on a seat which he knows to be firm and safe, and there is only one

other place (1 Cor. vii. 37) in the New Testament where the same verb is used to express firmness, decision, and an unshaken attitude.

Similar advice is given by the Apostle in other passages, but expressed by another word (*βέβαιος*). "And our hope of you is steadfast, knowing that, as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall ye be also of the consolation." (1 Cor. i. 7.) "For we are made partakers of Christ if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." (Heb. iii. 14). And St. Peter (1 Epis. v. 9) exhorts the elders to soberness and watchfulness, bidding them to resist the evil one with steadfastness in the faith. Again, in Heb. vi. 19: "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast." And so with us. All our steadfastness depends on faith; faith is the source and spring of all our actions; everything rests upon it; without it there would be no love, no trust; with it, if it be a living, active faith, we shall abound in the work of the Lord; to it we are to give all diligence, to add virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity: for if these things be in us and abound they will make us neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Unmoveable." This is the only place in the Bible where the word occurs; and the Greek so translated should more correctly be rendered "unmoved" or "constant" (*ἀμετακίνητος*), because to us men who have "no abiding city," and whose stay on earth is of short and uncertain duration, such a word as "unmoveable" is not competent of application.

In these energetic words, so full of peace and encouragement, the Apostle compassed our whole duty. Let nothing, he says, unsettle or shake your faith in this great doctrine; let nothing move you from the hope of the Gospel; stand fast in the faith; quit you like men, for there is an important work to be done which is the Lord's work; be strong in the strength provided for you, strong in the Lord and in the power of His might, for through Him you can do all things.

My brethren, there is much in the condition of the Corinthians analogous to our own, and this exhortation of the Apostle is applicable to ourselves. Are there not many things calculated to unsettle and unmove us? Our very contact with a corrupt and sinful world is enough to pull us down from the high standard of the Gospel to the dead level of indifference and folly. There is now as then the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life; there are those who will not endure sound doctrine, and after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers having itching ears, turning away their ears from the truth; there is still the evil one ready to pluck the faith out of our hands; but we have, thank God, the same armour (if only we put it on) with which to wrestle against principalities, against powers, against the

rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. To be steadfastly purposed and unmoved for Christ is undoubtedly the real difficulty of the Christian life; but the great help to this and every other is active work, to be "always abounding in the work of the Lord." The empty, swept, and garnished house must be filled with the Holy Spirit; our hours and minutes must be filled up with cheerful and profitable work which will breed in us temperance and self-control. And this work for God requires whole-heartedness, such as David, in his last solemn appeal, looked for when he called upon the congregation to contribute liberally to the work of building the Temple, that they might do honour to God. "Fill his hand," is the marginal reading (1 Chron. xxix. 5), for the man who works for Christ must always have his hands full. Now, the expression "always abounding in the work of the Lord" is a remarkable one. It is not merely doing the Lord's works of necessity, but doing it cheerfully, abundantly, abounding in it; to be rich in good works, always endeavouring to surpass our former self, leading from fruit to "more fruit." As growth is the law of the natural, so it is also of the divine life; and therefore with the Christian there is to be the manifested increase of every grace which is to be multiplied in the using. But further. We are *always* to abound, continually striving to do those things which are acceptable and well-pleasing to God. It is not that fluctuating, spasmodic work so common amongst us, but a steady single-eyed activity through evil report and good report, looking to God who will not forget to reward our efforts to promote His glory and to minister to the wants of others. But if our work is to be acceptable to the Great worker Who is ever working (for although He needs nothing all things need Him), it must proceed from a heart which has been given to Him, and from a life dedicated to His glory. Now, what is this "work of the Lord" in which we are to abound? It is all manner of duties, inward, and outward, towards God and man; not work done by Him but *for* Him, everything in fact which God requires in His commandments. Work for the Lord is, in the first place, obedience to His most holy word. "Oh, that thou hadst hearkened to My commandments, then would thy peace be as a river and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." The clergyman in his study, in the pulpit, in the sick-room; the mother in her home; the man of business amid his various engagements; the children in the school; the farmer in the field; the soldier at his post of duty; our intercourse with one another—all may do the work of the Lord, provided only it proceeds from right principles, and has right aims. "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

And lastly, look at the reward or benefit in thus working for God. Our labour is "not in vain." It

is no empty, purposeless, fruitless work, but "in the Lord" it is full, true, advantageous and, therefore, cannot be in vain. Our labour will not remain unrecompensed. God is not unrighteous to forget our work and labour of love; not even the "cup of cold water" given in His Name will He fail to remember. And the truth conveyed by reward must be of great importance, for we find it frequently referred to both in the Old and New Testaments. So far back as Genesis xv. 1 we read of the Lord speaking to Abraham in a vision: "I am thy shield and exceeding great reward." Not merely was reward an *attribute of God*, but He Himself was Abraham's reward. God, speaking through Moses to the Levites, says in the Book of Numbers: "Ye shall eat in every place, ye and your households, for it is your reward for your service in the tabernacle of the congregation." Again, in the 19th Psalm, we have David's experience set forth: "Moreover by them (*i.e.*, the statutes and commandments) is thy servant warned, and in keeping them there is great reward." There is a reward not only *after* keeping, but *in* keeping God's commandments. And the same thought is expressed in the 62nd Psalm: "Also unto Thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for Thou rewardest to every man according to his work." And in the New Testament we have Christ's trinity of promise—"shall receive a righteous man's reward," "shall receive a prophet's reward," "shall in nowise lose his reward." Thus we plainly see that in proportion as we sacrifice and labour for the Lord shall be our resurrection glory; and the hope of His reward ought not to make us indolent, but rather give us courage to "go forward" to victory. And while we are busy, and contending with the difficulties and temptations that surround us, let us hear with joy our Lord proclaiming, "Behold, I come quickly. I come to put an end to the labour of my toiling servants; My reward is with me to give to every man, according as his work shall be, and recompense with royal bounty every work and labour of love." Therefore, my brethren,

"Go, labour on;—thy hands are weak,
Thy knees are faint, thy soul cast down;—
Yet falter not: the prize is near,
Thy throne, the kingdom and the crown.
Toil on, toil on; thou soon shalt find
For labour, rest; for exile, home.
Soon shalt thou hear the Bridegroom's voice
The midnight cry, 'Behold, I come.'"

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has left Addington for the Continent until the end of September. Letters on business should be addressed to the assistant private secretary, Lambeth Palace.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

Certain HARNESS' Cure.

ELECTROPATHIC BELT

FOR
RHEUMATISM

Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.

On y Address,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of a Redphone Place.)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1889.

COMPREHENSION HAS ITS LIMITS.—
No. III.

(*Communicated.*)

AS an Irish Prelate said, the Irish Church is the most comprehensive in the world. How true this is of a Church which will not allow a cross, even on a Communion cover, I will not stop to inquire. It is said that the Australian Church is about to sanction Presbyterian orders; and the Spanish new Prayer Book allows heterodox notions as to Baptism. But I pass all this over. We know that there is no limit to God's love for every man. Each will be judged according to what he hath, according to the talents committed to him. God's love then comprehends all men. But He has laid down rules for His Church. By these we must be bound, though He is not. His rules for His Church we have embodied in the Prayer Book. We must be comprehended by them. This I have shown as to inspiration, Baptismal and Eucharistic grace. I now proceed to other points.

1. Absolution. The priest has a power here, which no layman has. He pronounces God's pardon, quasi-sacramentally, upon all who are penitent. This, a layman, though he may read words out of the Bible, is not authorized to do. As to private absolution, no one needs it except he be troubled in mind. When pronounced, after due examination, the man's state is not changed. It is only declared. We must keep within these limits, on the right hand and on the left.

2. Prayer and Eucharist for the dead. The Prayer Book sanctions neither, following Scripture. But prayers for the growth in grace of the imperfect

at death are reasonable, and not forbidden. To pray for such growth is very different from Rome's practice of offering sacrifice for a man's deliverance from purgatorial fire, and the priest being paid for such sacrifices. As to the Eucharist being performed after death, though not sanctioned, it is a solemn rite, and may be harmless. Let it be only understood that there is no new atonement; that the soul can be benefited only as it may by prayers; and that a memory of the dead and the benefit of the living are mainly held in view. Whatever may be done in private, this is not allowed in our Churches, or at funerals. The line must be drawn here.

3. We come next to Orders. We say nothing about countries where episcopacy cannot be had. God will judge extreme cases according to His merciful rules. Our Church and the Church Universal allows no order but Episcopalian. Those coming to us with any other pretended orders are ordained over again. We thus pronounce what went before as null and void. The Preface to our Ordinal only states Scripture truth, that the Apostles instituted these orders, of course, by Divine guidance. We have no more right to set aside this than Rome has to deny the cup to the laity.

4. Next we are to consider what is schism, as prayed against in the Litany. It is division as to worship. To say that division within a church is wrong, but harmless when it has torn it in two, is absurd. Besides, those who drew up the Litany certainly meant by schism separation, as different from false doctrine and heresy, which would include internal divisions in a Church: Our old Irish canons were drawn up by Usher. Our 5th, as well as your 9th and 11th, excommunicates all who own any other church but one. This, of course, we got rid of, that we may talk in our Conventions and Evangelical Alliance meetings of our many Scriptural Churches. How our clergy who attend such gatherings can pray against schism is marvellous. But what are we to think of the Dissenters who join us there? If they think us a Scriptural Church, Calvin says, no punishment is severe enough for them for separating. If they think us unscriptural, and unfit to communicate with, how do they excuse their joining us as brethren?

I think I have drawn the lines plainly enough. We must hold inspiration of Scripture so as not to turn its history into myths, or fables. We must hold a Baptismal grace on all, such as infancy is capable of, and the converted adult requires. As to Eucharistic grace, we are to hold that the Body of Christ, though confined to heaven alone, strengthens our souls. Absolution changes not a man's state, but his opinions thereof; and is to be pronounced only by those authorised thereto. Episcopal orders alone have Scripture authority. Schism is separation of communion—a sin to be prayed against. If any of these landmarks be

objected to, as false or needless, it will be my business to defend and maintain them.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—“J. B.,” in his letter to the PULPIT of the 17th inst., says that he “holds that it is perfectly legitimate to refer to moral instincts and kindly sympathies in testing the validity of any set of dogmas,” and proceeds to say: “I do not mean *my* impressions, intelligence, and kindly feelings, but those I observe to belong to human nature in our days.” This last sentence implies that *his* impressions, intelligence, and kindly feelings are *not* those of human nature. This being so, on his own principle, he is not qualified to “test the validity of any dogma.” Why, then, does he attempt to write on the subject at all? “It is coming abroad in a disorder, which he ought to be dissatisfied to find himself in at home.” What class of beings, then, does he belong to? Would it not be well for him to subject himself to a diagnosis at the hands of Darwin in order to ascertain this point clearly? Because upon it depends his right to interfere in the subject at all.

Let it be noticed that it is not of the “kindly feelings” of human nature in *general* that he speaks, but only of those which he “*observes*” to belong to it “in our days.” Just as if *his* observation was so perfect as to become an infallible rule, not only for his own guidance, but also for that of other people! Let us see how this will work. “The human nature of our days” includes the Whitechapel murderer. I wonder what “moral instincts and kindly sympathies” were in *him* to qualify him to “test the validity of dogmas”? It includes also the very large class of people whose “moral instincts” are *opposed* to “J. B.’s” doctrine, so that his own rule for his own purpose is a sad failure, there being *more* “moral instincts and kindly sympathies” against him than for him.

A dogma is a doctrine of Scripture put into a handy form for didactic purposes, and as an examination of Scripture can alone determine whether those doctrines are true or false, there is no use in this senseless chatter about the “kindly feelings” of human nature, or its “moral instincts and impressions.” The pith of the matter seems to be that “J. B.” finds in himself a strong repugnance to the idea of “everlasting punishment,” and then he *imagines* this is a reason against the truth of that doctrine. But there are many things which are repugnant to the feelings of human nature, and which are nevertheless true at the same time.

It is not a brilliant discovery to make, that the “moral sensibilities” progress under the teaching of the Bible. This is always the effect where its teaching is received. But how does the Bible produce this result? By annexing punishment to all evil-doing, especially the sentence of eternal separation from God. This acts as a strong deterrent with men in their dealings with each other; while its rewards, graciously promised to those who do well, lead them out into positive acts of kindness. “The *fear* of the Lord is

the *beginning* of wisdom," which leads to the blessedness of keeping his commandments.

But what is the *drift* of these remarks about the progression of the "moral sensibilities"? Simply this: That "J. B." has come to such a pitch of moral refinement that he can examine with unerring exactness the dogmas which "cruel ages have handed down to us"! But how can this be, when, as we have seen above, *his* sensibilities are not those of human nature? And when he admits that this beneficent result is brought about by Bible teaching, why not make the Bible the test of its own dogmas, and leave the sensibilities alone?

But what "cruel ages" does he refer to? He mentions something as having taken place in the time of Gardiner, when the nation was emerging from Popery. But the doctrine of everlasting punishment, being coeval with the Gospel history, was in existence hundreds of years prior to the time of Gardiner, so that his quotation from English history does not apply.

No one, as far as I am aware, is trying to prevent him by "harsh words and unproved asseverations" from examining any dogma. I should be very sorry to use harsh words towards him personally. And the only ones that I can think of as having that appearance, which I used, are those in "Depart from me." But these are not mine; nor are they cruel, but only just. Bible quotations were the principal proof I gave him of any "asseverations" I made, and if he does not take that, what am I to do with him? Apparently it is not sufficient for him; he must find the proof written in the "moral instincts, impressions, and kindly feelings of the human nature of our days"; and yet we have seen, a short time ago, that the testimony of these is dead *against* him. There is no lack of proper proof, but I am afraid there is a want of ability to perceive, or candour to acknowledge, the proof when given. I have no conceptions of heaven but those given in the Bible. His notion of it seems to be that its happiness will consist chiefly, if not entirely, in perpetual activity. He says that "those who have been trained in the school of Christ could not be happy unless permitted to strive earnestly for the relief of sorrow and suffering, and for the diffusion of (what he calls) truth and love." Yet we read of people "sitting on seats, falling down before Him that sits on the throne," chanting His praises while "they cast their crowns before Him." All these actions are opposed to the idea of perpetual exertion. And when he makes the happiness of heaven to depend upon "striving earnestly for the relief of sorrow and suffering," he does not seem to perceive that that happiness must come to an end when there is no more sorrow and suffering to relieve, which result is brought about by his final restoration theory, when all are brought home to heaven. His lot must be cast in strange quarters when he "seldom hears a sermon in which there is any reference to eternal punishment"; but this is no argument against the truth of the doctrine.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, 24th August, 1889.

SIR,—I will offer a brief reply to the letter of Mr. Sandlands in this day's PULPIT.

I consider that one of the great objects which the Scheme of Redemption accomplishes, is the correction of defective and perverted faculties. The whole

of the Sacred Volume has a progressive tendency in that direction.

In Phil. ii. 13 we have the gracious declaration, "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." We are taught (Ephes. ii. 8). "faith is the gift of God;" also (Gal. v. 6) "faith which worketh by love." Those texts are sufficient to maintain that consolatory assurance in my mind.

The Universalists do not explain away the texts named by Mr. Sandlands; "the wicked shall be turned into hell; the wages of sin is death." They compare those texts with others of an opposite nature, as the Bishop of Manchester recommended in his sermon. In that way they arrive at a conviction, that those painful and terrible processes are "not endless, but the way to righteousness." These last words I take from the series of discourses by the late Bishop of Argyll, published under the title of "Revelation Considered as Light."

I did not say that "we need no dogma." I have been endeavouring to show that the dogmas which inspire aversion in our age are not correct interpretations of Scripture.

The agonised feelings on a death-bed are sometimes a foretaste of that which comes immediately after. But it does not follow that the Scheme of Redemption will not accomplish ultimate recovery.

J. B.

Canonbury, August 17th, 1889.

SIR,—With reference to "J. B.'s" letter in your last issue of the PULPIT, I can see no argument against what he calls "eternal punishments" from the analogy he draws from the modification of our criminal code, and the abandonment of the slave-trade.

If the increased philanthropy of the civilised world is a valid argument in favour of a Being of unmixed benevolence, such as I presume "J. B." regards God, then it would seem that the thought of those whom Holy Scripture condemns in the 50th Psalm was true. In that Psalm God is represented as addressing those who were taking His covenant in their mouths, but yet were framing deceit in their tongue; and after enumerating the evil deeds of such an one, He adds: "These hast thou done; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself; but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes."

Therefore let "J. B." take heed how he nullifies the essential justice of God by arguments drawn from the humanity and philanthropy of mere earthly beings. "God is not a man that He should lie; neither the son of man, that He should repent," were the words of Balaam; and because there was no iniquity amongst those whom this prophet was invited to curse, "there was no enchantment against Jacob." But afterwards when Israel corrupted themselves, it is too patent to any one who diligently reads Holy Writ that the vengeance of God overtook them.

I will but conclude with an allusion to the last verse of the 3rd chapter of St. John's Gospel: "He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Putting aside therefore St. Matt. xxv. 46, in which the word *aiwvros* is used with regard to both the judgment of the ungodly, and the happiness of those who wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb, so that I hold that we are bound to hold the everlastingness of punishment, if we are not prepared to give up blessedness without end; but putting aside this passage, and taking the

passage I have just quoted, I ask our opponents how the wrath of God can abide or remain or continue on unbelievers, and yet after a thousand years or so be removed by the benevolence of God abstracted from His justice?

J. CHRISTIE.

Barnwood, August 19th, 1889.

CHURCH CATECHISM.

SIR,—I have read an interesting sermon in your columns by an Irish divine, Rev. Dr. Jordan. He speaks of the Church Catechism being taught in our Sunday-schools. Taught—but how? It is merely by rote, as Romanists teach the Pater Noster. I have been told by one who has examined, that, though the children can answer like parrots, they have not the slightest idea of the meaning of a word; nor did they show signs of any attempt on teachers' part to explain anything *Cui bono*, then? The Church Catechism has a most decided doctrinal meaning between Romish Theology on the one hand and Geneva on the other. Both extremes fight shy of it, especially when it treats of the grace of the Sacraments. A dignitary of one of our dioceses, an examining chaplain to the diocesan, told the young clergy "we can make nothing of the catechism." Why so? I suppose because it says that the consecrated bread and wine still retain the power of strengthening and refreshing our bodies, whereas Ritualists say that it retains merely the look, taste, etc., of bread. On the other side, Genevan Puritans scorn, as lately in a contemporary English paper, the idea that, in baptism, we are made "members of Christ, etc." Of course the same party scoff at the idea that, in the Eucharist, we "verily and indeed take and receive" in any sense the Body, etc., or its gracious influences. What I want to show is, that if we will not explain the Catechism, so as to guard our children from the Popish corporal presence and adoration, on the one hand, and the Puritan mere figure and commemoration on the other; if we show all this, as controversial and unimportant, we might as well teach it in Latin, like the Pater Noster, for all the good it will do our children as a preservative against Popery on one side, and Puritanism on the other. If anything be worth teaching, it is the meaning that is so, and not the mere ring of the words. Is the Catechism too hard to be explained? Has it a definite meaning? Are not our dignitaries and clergy capable of understanding? If not, God help the Sunday-school teachers! not to say the poor children. We are sick of clerical meetings and discussions on abstract metaphysical subjects. Let our clergy come to a decision on the meaning of the A B C, the very hornbook by which our children are to be taught their faith. Let them decide as to what the words mean; if they have any definite meaning at all, and let them train their school teachers that true doctrine may percolate down to our children. So alone shall we stop the constant lapse into Plymouthism and Baptists, and unless I am greatly mistaken, in some of our parishes to Popery. There are open questions to be left open, such as the Millennium and unfulfilled prophecy. But what is contained in the text book for children cannot so be deemed, or, if so, lay it aside as useless. Avoiding difficulties is like giving our soldiers swords and bayonets that will bend. He shoots in vain, who shoots wide of the gold, and of the target itself.

INQUIRENS.

THE new Bishop of Travancore, and very possibly the new Bishop of Sydney also, will be consecrated on All Saints' Day.—*Yorkshire Post*.

THE Chester correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* is informed that the report is incorrect that the Rev. James Cottingham has resigned the benefice of Shotwick, Chester.

THE *Rock*, referring to the reports as to the relations between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Spurgeon, states that the latter has the *entrée* to Addington Park at his pleasure, and the Archbishop recently enjoyed a long and interesting conversation with him.

BY an order in Council the rectory of St. Wilfrid's, Halton, near Lancaster, and the perpetual curacy of St. Saviour's, Aughton, near Lancaster, are, upon the recommendation of the Archbishop of York and Bishop of Manchester, united as one benefice.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the parishioners of Rillington, Malton, have heard with regret of the resignation of their vicar, the Rev. William Macdowall, who has held the living since 1865, but for about a twelvemonth past has suffered from cataract. The parish church was restored a few years ago through his exertions.

THE Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph have appointed Mr. Llewelyn Lloyd, assistant-organist for the last thirteen years, to the post of organist at the cathedral. There were fifteen applicants for the post, which had been made vacant by the death of Mr. R. A. Atkins, who held the office for fifty-five years.

THE Rev. Campbell Lock writes from Charlton Rectory, Hordean, Hants:—"This week, in making some alterations in my rectory, the workmen have discovered behind some wainscoting a remarkably handsome fourteenth-century doorway of similar character to windows in my church, which from entries in my old register-books, &c., I have every reason for believing formed part of a church house, to which the rectory itself has been added at a later date. I am having the archway opened out and restored."

THE Bishop of Chichester, accompanied by Archdeacon Mount, has left England for his annual holiday in Switzerland and will not return until the meeting of the diocesan conference in October. The Bishop, who will complete his eighty-seventh year in November next, continues to administer the diocese with undiminished vigour; and as an instance of his energy it may be mentioned that on the occasion of the recent division in the House of Lord's on the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, his lordship, after recording his vote, returned to Chichester the same night, in order to fulfil an engagement on the following day.

WE are requested to state that the announcement that the Rev. J. S. Flynn, the Missions to Seamen chaplain for the shipping in Falmouth Roads, had been nominated to the rectory of St. Mewan was premature. During the nine years that Mr. Flynn has been boarding ships in Falmouth Roads in the Missions to Seamen cutter "Sickle," he has officiated afloat to about 40,000 different men, of whom 1,272 have taken the total abstinence pledge and 1,488 have bought Bibles or Prayer-Books. 2,681 ships were thus boarded last year at that anchorage, and 426 services held with their crews, none of whom would

have received the ministrations of a clergyman on board their vessels but for the Missions' to Seamen chaplain in that roadstead.

THE death is announced of the Rev. William Wales, Hon. Canon of Peterborough, and late Chancellor of the Diocese.

THE *Globe* notices with regret that the Bishop of Bath and Wells has lost his fifth son, Captain Arthur Henry Wriothesley Hervey. Captain Hervey, who was in his thirty-eighth year, had been seriously ill for some time, and the late celebration of the Bishop's golden wedding was observed in a very quiet manner by the family in consequence.

THE following resolution was passed unanimously at a meeting of the Rugely ruridecanal chapter, at Rugely, on Thursday last:—"That this chapter hails with satisfaction—as a step towards peace—the Dean of Peterborough's suggestion that Convocation should declare plainly that the Ornaments Rubric should be taken in its natural and obvious sense, without the insertion of a negative." Moved by the Rev. D. S. Murray (Blithfield), seconded by the Rev. E. Samson (Brereton).

THE following appeared in the *Pall-Mall Gazette* with reference to the Rev. Christopher Bowen:—"Few, perhaps, who listen to the velvety accents of Lord Justice Bowen realise the fact that his old father, one of the most venerable clergyman in the country, still lives, and is as hearty to-day as ever, though he is in his eighty-ninth year. His sermons are models of eloquence, his delivery magnificent, his penmanship as clear and small as print. He can walk twelve miles a day, and is ever proud of his son, upon the bench, or that son so well known as the head of the modern department at Harrow. To see Mr. Bowen and Lord Tennyson together is a treat, and only the other day the ancient priest stretched forth a helping hand to the feeble poet to lift him from his chair eliciting a good humoured growl—'Ha! eighty-nine helping eighty!'"

At the suggestion of the Bishop of London the Diocesan Council for the Welfare of Young Men undertook and are carrying out successfully the scheme of a Seaside Camp for London Youths. Since the opening of the camp on the sand hills at Deal on the 24th June, 443 working lads, too poor to get a holiday at the seaside in any other way, have been taken in. Every Saturday afternoon at 3.15 from Charing-Cross a detachment of fifty or sixty leave for a week or a fortnight at the camp. The life in camp consists of bathing, drill, cleaning up camp, orderly and guard duty, together with cricket, football and other games, excursions and evening entertainments. Daily prayer is said by the chaplain, and on Sunday Morning Prayer is held at eleven and Evening Prayer at six o'clock, either in the large marquee or the open air, when suitable addresses are given. The corporation of Deal have kindly provided the site for the camp, and the townspeople have shown the most ready interest in the scheme. One member of the camp was overheard to remark just before leaving "Good-bye, dear old sea, good-bye, dear old tent, good-bye, good dinners for a year." The Diocesan Council wish to keep this beneficial institution going for another six weeks this year, and to make it an annual affair, and this can only be done by further public support. Subscribers of a guinea and upwards may nominate

youths for the camp (who must be working lads between the ages of fourteen and seventeen), and the clergy of poor districts have a like privilege. Each youth or his friends contributes half-a-crown a week for his holiday.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Bell, Rev. Maurice F., Curate of St. Agnes', Toxteth Park, Liverpool; Vicar of Appleton, near Malton.
 Douglas-Hamilton, Rev. H. A., Vicar of Winslow; Domestic Chaplain to Lord Chesham, and Rector of Latimer-with-Flaunden.
 Duncan, Rev. R., M.A., Chaplain of Whitehaven Infirmary.
 Everett, Rev. E. H., Rector of Tinwell, Stanford.
 Fall, Rev. J. W., Curate of Walcot, near Bath; Vice-Principal of Trinity College, Candy, Ceylon.
 Flinn, Rev. Patrick Morrison, B.A., Rector of Morgan and Martin alias Dedimus, Cornwall.
 Freeman, Rev. Gage Earle, M.A., Vicar of Askham, Penrith.
 Gore-Browne, Rev. W., M.A., Incumbent of St. Hilda's, Darlington (newly constituted).
 Hunt, Rev. Herbert B., Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Morley; Vicar of Wyke, near Bradford.
 Jennings, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Bettws G.G., Corwen.
 Jervis-Edwards, Rev. T., M.A., Vicar of Cobham.
 Jones, Rev. Henry, B.A., Vicar-Choral of St. Asaph Cathedral.
 Keene, Rev. F. W., Curate of Morton, near Gainsborough; Vicar of Mission, near Bawtry, Notts.
 Macdonald, Rev. F. C., Curate of Bishopwearmouth; Vicar of the new parish of St. Hilda, Sunderland.
 Norman, Rev. J. G., Curate-in-Charge of Henley Mansel, Blechley.
 Owen, Rev. Elias, Rector of Efenechtyd, Ruthin; Vicar of Caerfallwch, Holywell.
 Palmer, Rev. Henry Carew, Curate of Bradenham, Bucks; Vicar of Filkins, Oxon.
 Perry, Rev. Edward J., Curate of St. James's, Clerkenwell, and Assistant-Master of Merchant Taylors' School; Principal of Trinity College, Candy, Ceylon.
 Remington, Rev. Reginald, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Mansel-Lacy and Wormesley, Herefordshire; Perpetual Curate of Wormesley.
 Sidebotham, Rev. H., M.A., Canon of Gibraltar; Vicar of St. John's, Rowhams, Southampton.
 Waldren, Rev. William, Vicar of Bronington, Flintshire.
 Wallace, Rev. John Duncan Clement, M.A., Curate of Madresfield; Vicar of Melton Ross c. New Barnetby, Lincolnshire.
 Whelpton, Rev. Henry Urlin, M.A., Minister of the newly-constituted District of All Soul's, Clive Vale, Hastings.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Beal, Rev. Samuel, D.C.L., Rector of the parish, retired Chaplain R.N., and Professor of Chinese in the London University, at Greens Norton Rectory, Towcester, on the 20th inst. aged 64.
 Cook, Rev. James, LL.M., Rector of the parish, at Peopleton, Pershore, on the 21st inst., aged 68.
 Morgan, Rev. Richard Williams, B.A., on the 22nd inst., aged 65.
 Smith, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of the parish, at Middlezey Vicarage, on the 15th inst., aged 82.
 Smith, Rev. John, Rector of Little Hinton, on the 18th inst., aged 76.
 Wales, Rev. William, Hon. Canon of Peterborough, and late Chancellor of the Diocese, at 7, Stanford Place, Leamington, on the 19th inst., aged 85.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RULING OF THE SPIRIT.

BY THE REV. CHARLES E. TISDALL, D.D.,
CHANCELLOR OF CHRIST CHURCH CATHEDRAL,
DUBLIN, AND INCUMBENT OF ST. DOLOUGH'S,
DIOCESE OF DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF
ST. MARK, DUBLIN, ON SUNDAY EVENING,
AUGUST 11TH, 1889, BEING THE EIGHTH SUN-
DAY AFTER TRINITY.

"He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."—
PROVERBS xvi. 32.

IN recording this statement, it was clearly the purpose of the wise king to teach the duty of control of temper. The action of the will in controlling it is here represented as being *higher* than its action when displayed in physical force. "He that is slow to anger" is affirmed to be "*better* than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." The subject which these words suggest for consideration is so intimately connected with that upon which I preached here on Sunday last from the words, "Let patience have her perfect work," that it may be suitably, and, with the divine aid, profitably taken as that of the present discourse.

Now, there is a form of angry temper which gives audible proof of its (so to speak) volcanic character, by the startling eruptions which repeatedly take place when violent language is uttered by those under its baneful influence. As the literal volcano sends forth lava in desolating streams, so the disastrous effects of that uncontrolled temper are severely felt by those who are so unfortunate as to be obliged to live within reach of its outbreaks. There is, also, a less demonstrative form of angry temper. It is not quite so explosive or so frequent in its manifestations, but there is evidence sufficient to show that the fire is alive within. There is, moreover, the sullen form of it, when the fire is smouldering and there is a suppressed glow which reminds those in the vicinity of it that an enemy to their peace lies in ambush. The experience of many a quietly-disposed person is similar to that of which we read in the hundred-and-twentieth Psalm: "Woe is me that I sojourn in Mesech, that I dwell in the tents of Kedar. My soul hath long dwelt with him that hateth peace. I am for peace, but, when I speak, they are for war."

Methods of ruling such forms of temper have been adopted by those who, although not under the

influence of religious principles, are, for prudential reasons, and from motives of secular policy, disposed to exercise self-control. Remedies are tried which fail to reach the *seat* of the disorder. When the waters of Jericho were so deadly that the men of the city complained to Elisha of the evils which resulted from their impurity, the prophet went to the *spring* of the unwholesome streams, and there cast in salt, saying, "Thus saith the Lord, I have healed these waters; there shall not be from thence any more death or barren land." "So the waters," it is added, "were healed according to the saying of Elisha which he spake." Now there is a lesson of spiritual wisdom to be learned from the procedure of the prophet upon that, as well as upon other occasions. It is at the *source* of an evil that reformation should commence, otherwise no effect of a permanent nature can be produced. If any improvement take place, it will be merely superficial, and, for practical purposes, unsatisfactory. Earth-born expedients may be resorted to for controlling irascible tempers, but so long as there is disregard of the prescriptions of the Divine Physician of souls (who, inasmuch as He thoroughly knows "what is in man," knows where the work of healing should begin), so long as vigilance is neglected, and prayer "restrained before God," there cannot be entertained any reasonable expectation of success in "ruling the spirit." Temptations to act and speak intemperately cannot be effectually resisted if there be not habitual "keeping of the heart, out of which are the issues of life."

For devoting a sermon to this subject it may well be asked, "Is there not a cause?" It is sad to reflect how often formidable hindrances are put in the way of the spread of practical religion by the incautious procedure of some professing to be under its influence. "The wrath of man," we are told, "worketh not the righteousness of God." Regardless of that fact, impetuous champions of orthodoxy—by their want of tact, their precipitation, their vehemence, by their neglect, in short, of "ruling the spirit"—actually *defeat* the purpose which they profess to have at heart. Their mode of dealing with doctrinal errors has, consequently, the appearance of contending for *victory* rather than for *truth*. The careful "ruling of the spirit," which ought to be a precaution invariably adopted by theological disputants, has been often so completely neglected that irritating language has been used, and that with deplorable results. On this subject, Chalmers, in his masterly discourse on "The effect of man's wrath in the agitations of religious controversies," has forcibly remarked—"It can require no very deep insight into our nature to perceive that when there is proud or angry intolerance on the side of truth, it must call forth sullen and determined obstinacy on the side of error. Men will submit to be reasoned out of an opinion, and more especially when they are treated with respect and kindness, but they will not submit

to be cavalierly driven out of it. There is a revolt in the human spirit against contempt and contumely, insomuch that the soundest cause is sure to suffer from the help of such auxiliaries. When passion is enlisted on one side of a controversy, then provocation is awakened on the other side, and the parties, erecting themselves into a stouter and loftier attitude than before, stand to each other in respective positions which are mutually impregnable. It is this infusion of temper by which the force even of the mightiest argument is paralysed. It is when disdain meets with defiance, when exasperating charges meet with indignant recriminations, when the shouts of exulting victory may sting the bosoms of adversaries with the humiliations, but never draw from their lips the acknowledgment of defeat, it is when the war of words is animated by feelings such as these, that Truth, whose "still, small voice" is all-powerful, falls from her omnipotence and her glory, and Falsehood, resolute in the midst of such stormy agitations, is only riveted more firmly upon her basis." "To the perversity of human error there is superadded the still more hopeless perversity of human wilfulness." The words just quoted are in perfect accord with Apostolic teaching: "Let nothing be done through *strife or vain glory*." "Speaking the truth in *love*." "In *meekness* instructing them that oppose themselves, if peradventure God will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." To the exhortations, "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith;" "Quit you like men, be strong;" is added another, which has reference to the kindly spirit which should ever accompany obedience to them: "Let all your things be done with *charity*."

In private as well as public scenes of Christian enterprise there is often, unhappily, such neglect of the "ruling" of the "spirit," that a glaring contrast is presented between the nature of the lessons taught and the temper of those who undertake to teach them. That temper, instead of having an attractive, has a repellent tendency. Zeal and sincerity upon the part of the teacher, are, no doubt, indispensable, but the zeal should be "according to knowledge," and the sincerity tempered with discretion. There should be patient study of character, intelligent observation of its varieties, watchfulness for favourable opportunities for the conveyance of instruction, and prayer for success to Him who in the field of spiritual husbandry as He is in that of the literal, is the alone "giver of the increase." The obligations of the Christian life should ever be taught in the spirit of that wisdom, the characteristics of which are that it is "pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy." When the "wisdom which cometh from above" guides the teachers, their manner becomes an element of weight and influence in the hallowed and unspeakably blessed work of leading souls to Christ.

Possessed of that wisdom, they do vastly more than teach the truths of His Gospel in a didactic way, because the persuasiveness of their method, and the tenderness and consideration with which they deal with those whom they instruct, prove them to be under the influence of the doctrines which they teach, show that they *live* as well as profess the faith.

It is, doubtless, brethren, more or less humiliating to look at this subject in the practical light in which I am endeavouring to bring it under your consideration; but you *must* so look at it if you would be convinced of the momentous character of the responsibility attaching to your Christian vocation, for practising control of temper. Remember the saying of the Redeemer with reference to the sin of putting a stumbling-block in the way of others: "It is impossible but that offences will come, but woe unto him through whom they come. It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones." Limited, indeed, and therefore defective, is the view which, it is to be feared, is frequently taken of the possibility of being guilty of that sin. Not only by the grosser or more flagrant acts of inconsistency on the part of those professing the religion of Christ may "offences come," but also by unrestrained tempers, and by words "unadvisedly" spoken. Earnest, then, should be your prayers for the bestowal of that heavenly grace by which temper is sweetened, and the tendency to act and speak uncharitably effectually counteracted. There is, no doubt, what may be termed a *constitutional* amiability of temper and disposition, in which there is no element of *religious* principle. There is a guardedness of speech which is alike devoid of it, and they who are fortunately so blessed should give all diligence to improve in *other* directions; but there are numbers who, by their uniformly repulsive manners and unguarded language, so impair their capability for usefulness that it would be well for those with whom they are brought into association, and well, for their own sakes, if they would prayerfully seek to profit by frequent meditation upon those words of Solomon, "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city." It would be wise in them to offer, day by day, that prayer of the Psalmist: "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth. Keep the door of my lips." "Death," as well as "life," is "in the power of the tongue." Potent for incalculable evil or good is the marvellous faculty of speech, of which it was once eloquently said: "Wonderful though it be, it is not wonderful enough to describe itself. When God would send His own Son into the world, He sent Him under the name of 'The Word,' as though to show the dignity, the excellence of speech. The gift is so costly, so impregnate with Deity, that to misuse it may be likened to sacrilege, to the pro-

fanation of an august and infinite mystery." That faculty, when guarded by Him who bestowed it, becomes a powerful means of co-operating with those who, in their respective positions of influence, "serve their generation according to His will." May it be mercifully granted you to keep temper and speech under such restraint that you cause no obstruction to the spread of the kingdom of Him who, in His dealing with human character, as in all other acts of His "most holy life," has left us "an example that we should follow His steps."

CHRISTIAN SYMPATHY THE NEED OF OUR TIMES.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH MASKELL, MASTER AND CHAPLAIN OF EMANUEL HOSPITAL, AND ASSISTANT CURATE OF ST. JAMES-THE-LESS, WESTMINSTER.

SERMON PREACHED AT EMANUEL HOSPITAL, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 4TH, 1889.

"Without natural affection."—2 TIM. iii. 3 (part 7).

THE Greek word, according to its derivation, implies the absence even of those feelings of natural tenderness which persons of the same kindred, such as parents and children, brothers and sisters, usually cherish for one another; the absence of those sentiments of love and duty which by the very instinct of nature we experience for those about us. It may be taken as "without sympathy" for others, and this has a wider application than to those of our own kindred, since we are bidden to "honour all men," and to "love our neighbour as ourselves." St. Paul is warning Timothy of certain evil days which seemed to be fast approaching in consequence of the wide-spread corruption at work in the world. "In the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, proud, railers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, *without natural affection*."

The expression, "in the last days," may mean little more than "in the future." St. Paul foresaw that the world's corruption was always in danger of increase, since it is in the nature of evil to spread far and wide, and to grow from bad to worse. Moreover, even many a virtue may become a vice—thrift, for instance, may become selfishness and greed; self-denial, self-righteous contempt for others; hatred of sin, unsympathising hatred of the sinner; while pity for the sinner may degenerate into weak tolerance of wrong-doing. Thus it was with the Pharisees in our Lord's time. The Pharisees, no doubt, began well. They arose at a time when the Levitical law was neglected, and ordinances which, let us ever remember, were of divine appointment, had become disused or imperfectly obeyed. But in time this zeal for the

divine law degenerated into a mere punctilious ritualism, which regarded religion as chiefly to do with ceremony, and which even treated the law of God with contempt by adding observances to the letter of the law as if the divine will had not supplied precepts enough. Pharisaism also made void the law by disregarding its essence, discouraging charity, and engendering contempt for the lowly, unfortunate, and unlearned. It is plain that the Apostle foresees something like Pharisaism in the Church of the future. He is not referring to the heathen world. He writes evidently of those who would call themselves Christians; of those "having the form of godliness but denying the power thereof." He predicts that in these "last times" there would be a strange co-existence of moral evil with an outward show of interest in sacred things. There would be plenty of religiousness, but no true religion; a wide religious profession but no growth in grace and goodness. In the family, disobedience to parents, intense selfishness and self-love; in social and personal life, a spirit of covetousness and pride, a general indifference to others' welfare, a failure of truth and honesty, impatience of authority, and of the rights and feelings of others; neglect of common duties, devotion to selfish pleasure, and a cynical contempt for poverty, modesty, and meekness of spirit. It is not implied that there would be no virtue left in the world; nor that the whole Church would be corrupt; but that the vices condemned would be common, and would be seen even in the front ranks of the Church.

St. Paul saw the signs and tokens of this approaching corruption amongst professing Christians in his own days, and he predicts a time when such vices would be common and lightly regarded. I do not think the Apostle is referring to any special time; Christians at all times have been liable to fall into these vices, and to lose the savour of their religion. I am not sure that the entire passage is not an exact description of the age in which we live. The words, in my judgment, may be applied with considerable force of truth to the Christian world in these days. St. Paul describes here a selfish individualism which concerns itself merely with the outward and the agreeable, leaving the heart untouched, and the conscience blunted. There has been, we know, a great revival of religion in these times; certainly a great revival of the outward forms and tokens of religion amongst the people. More churches have been built and rebuilt during the present generation than at any previous period since the erection of our great cathedrals; worship has been made more stately and becoming; preaching has been made, at any rate, more lively and popular, if not more instructive. Greater attention is now paid to the outward machinery of the Church. Guilds, societies, Bible classes, the temperance movement, missions, and many other efforts for the moral

improvement of our people witness to the great religious activity of our times.

I look back upon a time when there was a good deal of neglect of these outward things, or far less talk about them; when there were fewer services, rarer communions, and less lively music, although I know well that all the essential duties of a parish, such as the visitation of the sick, the religious education of the young, and charity shown to the poor, were every bit as well, or better done than now. There were plenty of real men in those days, even if they were not quite so smart as we are now expected to be, and true excellence was far better esteemed. We have advanced, it may be, in the form of godliness, but may not have advanced in the godlike graces of charity, sympathy and brotherly love, in those necessary but simple and unobtrusive graces of character which it is the purpose of Christianity to produce. May we not find in the words of the Apostle in connection with our text a striking forecast of our own times?

"Without natural affection," *i.e.*, without sympathy and consideration for others; wanting in the instinct of fellow-feeling for our kind. It implies a tendency to think only of self, a general neglect of the duties we owe to others, and especially to those who have claims of kinship and neighbourhood upon us. When Christians acquire this temper they sink below the level of heathenism. There have, indeed, been some forms of heathenism which would seem to engender the vices condemned by St. Paul. Heathen mothers have been known to expose their children, when sickly, and of the female sex, to an untimely death, and others have thought it no sin to hasten the departure of the aged when past work and useless to the community. But these actions have been regarded as kindly, and intended to save weakly lives from suffering and pain. We Christians profess to regard human life as sacred; we boast of our hospitals and our charities, and yet in numberless ways we treat weakness and infirmity most cruelly. We do not put the aged to death, but we treat old age with scant respect. We talk contemptuously enough of those who have given the best years of their lives to the discharge of difficult duties, and we think it no shame to thrust them out into the cold when their strength is failing and their hair is growing grey. When they have ceased to be smart, let them go! We seem to regard piety, goodness, experience and the conscientious discharge of duty, unblest by outward success, as if they were criminal. An old horse is permitted to graze away his days in the paddock; an old servant may go to the workhouse, or worse. Children who prosper in life treat their elderly parents, in the hour of misfortune, without the least consideration, and everywhere it is not character which is esteemed, but success, however won; by secret fraud, by flattery of others, and by smartness rather than by conscientious devotion to duty. "With-

out natural affection"—without sympathy—worship of rank, wealth, and cleverness, but no true pity for the weak, the unfortunate, and the unassuming. This absence of sympathy and respect for everything that is not strong and flourishing is the vice of our times, and well is it branded by the Apostle as the special type of ungodliness. "God is love, and he that loveth not knoweth not God." Jesus Christ as our sympathising High Priest is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," having "compassion upon the ignorant and them that are out of the way." Sympathy was essential to the perfection of His character as our Redeemer, and hence He became "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh," and "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." He had contempt for none but those who were false and cruel, like the Pharisees; love and pity breathed forth in every gracious word He uttered; but for cold-hearted selfishness He had no toleration. His only bitter words were reserved for those who had no pity for others.

This absence of a kindly sympathy is common in our times. We may trace it in the general impatience with authority, whether parental or public; in the ill-manners tolerated even in high places; in the justification often shown to a resistance of the law, and a refusal to satisfy just debts; in the general desire to confiscate lawful property, and to ignore the liberties, the feelings, and the rights of those who differ from us in opinion. We may trace it in the love of display, in the pride and worldliness of the rich, and in the selfish ingratitude and envious murmurings of the poor. We need not be surprised to see it in connection with unbelief in God and the Bible. The most intolerant persons have always been those who claim the fullest liberty for themselves. Hence in publications devoted to what is called "free thought" religion is attacked in terms of extreme arrogance and bigotry. And in association with much that passes for political reform and the removal of social inequalities we see a great deal of personal covetousness and intolerance. There is a pseudo-socialism abroad which is most truly only individualism under another name. It has been well said that "whereas Christian socialism teaches us to say, 'You are as good as I am,' the false socialism lay stress upon the contention 'I am as good as you.'" The friends of freedom are not seldom the least liberal in their social relations, and the least fair to others. Christianity teaches us to "honour all men"; neither to rob the rich nor oppress the poor; neither to treat the great with disrespect nor to oppress the small; to promote brotherhood amongst all ranks, and to flatter no class at the expense of the other.

But, unhappily, the vicious principles condemned have even invaded the Church herself. There is a strange absence of sympathy in much that passes for religion and benevolence in our times. Take our charity organisation societies for instance.

The motive is sound enough ; to encourage thrift, to repress mere begging, to find work for those who can labour, and relief for the really distressed. And yet many of the deserving poor would rather starve than submit to the harsh and inquisitorial methods adopted by the agents of these societies. Are we not too accustomed to consider charity as synonymous with subscribing to societies and supporting institutions instead of the personal discharge of benevolent duties ? It is because we omit this personal discharge of duty that we treat the unfortunate with so much cold-hearted contempt, talk of their suffering as always brought on themselves, and ask, "Why should we bear any part of the burden, we who are so prudent and careful of our own" ? Do we never heed the voice which says "It is more blessed to give than to receive" ; or, "we then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves" ; or, again, "support the weak, comfort the feeble-minded ; be patient towards all men." How many of our ancient charitable bequests have been, under the name of "reform," and with the sanction of our rulers, alienated from old age, orphanage, and adversity, to benefit the well-to-do !

Take, again, the so-called religious press. Observe how uncharitably the different sections of the Church write one of another—Low Churchmen of High Churchmen, Churchmen of Nonconformists, and Nonconformists, in the name of greater spirituality and religious equality, of the clergy of the English Church !

Take, again, the temperance movement ; most laudable in the intention to diminish drunkenness, and to improve the people all round ; but grievously marred and injured by many of its friends, through the self-righteous, contemptuous, and intolerant tone which they adopt. As if there were no other sins to be condemned than intemperance in drink, and as if the spiritual pride of self-denial were not quite as bad in God's sight. Many allow themselves to speak with unsympathising contempt, not only of the drunkard but of the moderate drinker, as hopelessly bad ; whereas many intemperate men, to say nothing of the moderate, are most generous and kindly, both in and out of their cups, to others. These habits of excess have been perhaps brought on by a social and generous disposition, and there is an element of truth in the assertion, that when there was more social drinking there was more generosity and brotherly feeling than in these days. There are noble exceptions, but it seems to me that cold-heartedness is too often an accompaniment of cold water, and that the temperate allow themselves in an ungenerous intemperance of speech and conduct to a strange extreme. This is no excuse for excessive drinking, since drunkenness is a sin in the sight of God, and the fruitful parent of many other sins. Confirmed habits of drinking also destroy natural affection, and induce selfish-

ness. But it should remind the total abstainer that they are not the only good people in the world, and that there are sins condemned in the Bible quite as criminal as drinking to excess. Then, again, we are apt to forget that an undue thirst for strong drink is in the case of many a disease, and should be treated in a kindly and compassionate manner like every other disorder. Very often it is the result of disease, and a mistaken remedy for pain and sorrow. A good physician never thinks of curing the sick by perpetually scolding them, even if they have brought the sickness on themselves by their own wrong-doing. He seeks to sweeten his bitter medicine by kindly and generous words and actions. And you will never cure drunkenness by harsh speeches and unqualified contempt. No movement can secure anything better than an outward success that is not inspired and regulated by Christ-like sympathy.

There are those who profess to be religious, and even teachers of religion, who nevertheless think it gentlemanlike to suppress all emotion, and to maintain on all occasions a dignified reserve of feeling. To take an enthusiastic interest in anything that will not minister to self is considered "vulgar," as if there were any beauty or virtue in the stony stare and the silent indifference to one's surroundings which foreigners consider the defect, and many English people the ornament, of English ladies and gentleman, and a mark of good breeding. Is it not rather the token of a cold-hearted and selfish neglect of the duties we owe to others.

That great society which we call the Church was established by our Master to bind men into one brotherhood of love and friendship, and to leaven the world with Christ-like charity. The Church was never so active, perhaps, as at the present day, and yet there was never so little brotherhood and unity of heart. In these respects there has been retrogression rather than revival. How many true workers and faithful churchmen are called to pass through a long life in the Church's service without a single generous word of encouragement from their superiors or their brethren, and in old age to be turned away from the Church's doors as no longer of any use to an unnatural mother. We speak of the Church as our mother ; to how many of us is she any better than a stepmother at the best ? We need to be reminded that the Church may exist without endowments, without fine churches, and without rank and influence in the great world ; but never long without sympathy, brotherly love, and a corporate life. If there were a real Christian sympathy active amongst us these things would not be. If men admired the quiet graces of the Christian religion as much as they admire self-assertion, noise and display, the leading influences of true religion would spread more widely and surely, and the Church would not be, as too often

now, a byword of contempt amongst men of the world.

These things would never be if we lived in closer fellowship with the God of love, and with the all-merciful Saviour of men. We are like Martha cumbered about much serving, when we ought to be more like Mary, sitting at the feet of Jesus and listening to his words. We are so much occupied with schemes of general philanthropy that we cannot stoop down to the humbler virtues of brotherly kindness and a personal interest in the duties that lie next to us. We need not be less active but more thoughtful, more desirous of walking in His steps, who went about in the common walks of life "doing good." If we lived nearer to God we should catch something more of His spirit, and of those fruits of faith and holiness which are "love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness and patience."

And, another thing, we should be more satisfied to discharge in a Christian spirit those homely duties in the midst of which God's providence has placed us for our profit. We should realise that piety begins at home, and with the simple virtues of domestic life. The vices condemned by St. Paul are the very faults most prominent in those who find their spheres of usefulness anywhere but in their own homes. Charity and every other virtue must begin at home; there is no reason why it should never go abroad. But if it never stays at home and finds the sphere of its exercise amongst its own kindred and acquaintances, it cannot be true and real. It can only be the "form of godliness."

"He setteth the solitary in families"; the home is a divine institution older and quite as sacred as the Church. The earthly home, with all its cares and difficulties, its sorrows and its joys, is the sphere in which we are best prepared for the better home which is above. Parents and children, brothers and sisters, have much to bear from one another; but all that is a part of God's will. Our home is the divinely appointed school of discipline in which He is leading us through our sorrows and joys, our follies and mistakes even, to the threshold of that blest abode where all mistakes shall be corrected, where we shall see God "face to face," and behold all things in His light who is eternal love.

THE Bishop of Winchester left Farnham Castle on the 28th ult. for Coverwood, Ewhurst, near Guildford.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has appointed the festival of All Saints (November 1st) for the consecration of the Bishop-Suffragan of Derby. The Bishop of Travancore and the Bishop-Suffragan of Reading will be consecrated at the same time.

CANON WERE will continue to be the Bishop of Southwell's examining chaplain, and manage the arrangements for the ordinations. Communications on that subject should be addressed to him at St. Werburgh's Vicarage, Derby.

CHRISTIAN DUTIES IN PERILOUS TIMES.

NO. V.—THE PRAYERFUL SPIRIT.

BY THE REV. E. A. COOKE, VICAR OF ATTLEBOROUGH, NUNATON; AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE OF S. COLUMBA."

COURSE OF SIX SERMONS PREACHED DURING LENT, 1889, AT ATTLEBOROUGH.

"Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints."—EPHES. vi. 18.

I DO not intend to speak to you this morning upon the efficacy and duty of prayer, for that is authoritatively enforced not only by our Lord Himself and His apostles, but almost every page of the Old Testament inculcates the duty. It is therefore unnecessary for me to urge it upon a body of Christian men and women, who believe in a Personal Being to whom we owe our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life. There is not one of us, I would suppose, a complete stranger to prayer, and who has not at some period of his life offered up prayer to God. To pray seems an instinct of our nature, for even the infidel or the most degraded of men will, in a great contingency, address the invisible God with some such sudden ejaculation as "God, have mercy upon me." We all feel that this present life is one of need, of trial, and of evil, as St. Paul says, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they but we ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit—the redemption of the body." It is not to establish this duty that I desire to address you, but to enforce that heartfelt, prayerful spirit in which the true Christian should always be found. Prayer, to be acceptable to God, must not be an act of obedience only, but the language of the soul; of one who feels intensely his own great unworthiness, and at the same time is impressed with God's majesty and omniscience. As Origen, an early writer, has said, the life of a Christian should be one great continuous prayer. The promises in Scripture with respect to prayer, both public and private, are so abundant and explicit, that none need be left in doubt as to its importance; and nothing can show more clearly how far man has fallen from righteousness, and how helpless he has become than that Christ should have thought it necessary to address His disciples upon the subject: "He spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray and not to faint" (St. Luke-xviii. 1). What we are to consider is not the duty of prayer in the abstract (which all Christians must admit is forcibly enjoined in the Bible), but constancy and perseverance in, and an habitual practice of, the duty; not under some

particular circumstance, but under all; not in an exceptional contingency, but in every case.

And it is just such a spirit as this the Apostle would have his Ephesian friends to cultivate, and he points out to them in this the most practical of his epistles, that, as the conflict with evil is going on through the whole of life, so the Christian's armour is to be kept bright by constant prayer.

Having completed his precepts by exhorting to diligence and obedience, he concludes by telling them that the conflict can only be maintained by the putting on of the whole armour of God, having the loins girt about with truth, the breastplate of righteousness, the feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, binding and accompanying the whole by constant and fervent prayer. How beautifully prayer is put as the closing power, prompted by God's Spirit, by which they were to become victorious.

"Praying always with all prayer." "Always." It does not mean that we are to be always on our knees—to be praying every moment; that would be impossible. But it does mean that we must always be ready for prayer, carrying a prayerful spirit into every occupation. It is something more than observing a stated season, such as Lent; it is having God always in our thoughts, praying in every season, both in prosperity and adversity, in sickness and in health. But we must bear in mind that when we pray, "Alway with all prayer and supplication," it must not be a mere saying of prayer, and by fits and starts, but in the Spirit, guided by Him who alone can teach us to pray as we ought. As with all worship, the heart must go with the lips. Shakespeare has said, with apostolic wisdom, "The words fly up, the thoughts remain below: words without thoughts never to heaven go."

Now, the words "Prayer and supplication" are often rendered by the authors of our Version to denote the same thing; but whilst they have been practically faultless in their translation, there are several passages in the Bible which would have been more clearly and expressively rendered had they adhered to the original. "Prayer" comes from a word in the Hebrew which means petition or appeal, and from the Greek *δέχομαι* to want, thus implying on the part of the asker a sense of need. "Supplication" is a more submissive word, and usually refers to supplication for protection from an inferior to a superior, from one who, under a sense of guilt, flees to an altar with offerings as symbols of supplication (compare Exodus xxx. 7, 8; Zeph. iii. 10; St. Luke i. 9; Rev. viii. 3, 4). In such cases it was not an uncommon thing for suppliants to bring olive branches as an emblem of peace or gratitude of a full heart. Livy, an early classical writer, illustrates this in one of his books, where he mentions the case of the delegates from the Locrians, squalid and in rags, who came into

the hall where the consuls were sitting, and extended the badges of suppliants—olive branches—according to the custom of the Greeks, and prostrated themselves on the ground before the tribunal with a lamentable cry.*

The expression "praying always" is very commonly used by St. Paul, and for that reason deserves particular attention. Whilst it does not mean, as I have already said, that we are to be continually on our knees, it does mean we are to pray much, and always to have a prayerful frame of mind. Our Lord knew, St. Paul knew, how needful it was, and what our life would be without it; hence the frequency and earnestness with which the duty is enjoined.

For men and women differently circumstanced it would be impossible to prescribe how often or at what times prayer should be offered. In this and many other duties we must be guided by circumstances; but there can be no doubt about one thing that if we compare the place and importance given in the primitive and apostolic times to this great Christian duty with that which it seems to have amongst Christians in this nineteenth century, I greatly fear we have much to mourn over. How different the world would be were we a praying people—believing that the "effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much"; if we, like David, could say, "Morning and evening and at noon will I cry aloud, and He shall hear my voice" (Psalm lv.); and again in another place, "I will give myself unto prayer." We read of Daniel that, even when a decree was issued against prayer, he was not deterred; but when the writing was signed he went into his house, and, his windows being open in his chamber towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime. Then, again, there are special seasons, such as Lent, when our Church calls upon us to "chastise the flesh that it be not too wanton, but tamed and brought in subjection to the spirit; that the spirit may be more fervent and earnest in prayer; and that our fast be a testimony and witness with us before God of our humble submission to His High Majesty."† A time of affliction is certainly one that calls for exceptional prayer such as Jacob experienced when under apprehension of his brother's violence, he sought refuge in prayer, and said, "O God of my father Abraham and God of my father Isaac . . . deliver me, I pray thee, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau, lest he will come and smite me, and the mother with the children; and Thou saidst, I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for multitude." Thus in prayer we may find, as the eminent saints of old found, the alleviation of our troubles; and the public prayers of the Church may be to us times of

* Lib. xxix., c. 16. † First Homily, "On Fasting."

refreshing, for it is promised that those who "wait upon the Lord" shall find their strength renewed in Him; "they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint" (Is. xl. 31).

Another element in complete prayer is laid down in the words "watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication." "With all perseverance." This is the only place in the Bible where the word is so translated, which literally means continuance, as in Col. iv. 2, "Continue (or persevere) in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving"; that is, we are not to be discouraged at not receiving immediate answers to our prayers—not to give up in despair and say there is no use in praying any more; but, like Jacob, wrestling with the angel, like the Syrophenician woman who drew a "yea" from Christ's "nay," like the widow whose importunity was rewarded, so we are to continue instant in prayer, and in nothing be anxious, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let our requests be declared unto God.

And, lastly, I would have you notice another important element in prayer—one too often forgotten—that of intercession, or a pleading with God on behalf of others. Whilst enjoining the duty of prayer for ourselves, the apostle did not forget the wider family of the Church of Christ on earth; that being a corporate body, its members had the same hopes, fears, wants, desires, and, though differently circumstanced in life, there was no difference in their spiritual relationship. All through his epistles we find this principle of intercession running like a vein of silver.

To the Philippians (i. 4) St. Paul wrote, "I thank my God upon every remembrance of you, always in every prayer of mine for you all making request with joy." To Philemon (4), "I thank my God, making mention of thee always in my prayers," and to the Colossians (i. 9), "For this cause we also, since the day we heard of it, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding."

Then if we turn to 1 John v. 16, and the epistle by St. James, v. 14, 15, we there find the hopes and efficacy of intercessory prayer or "supplication for all saints," as enjoined by St. Paul. St. John says, "If any man see his brother sin, a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death." Hear what St. James says, and which reminds us of our own sublime Service for the Visitation of the Sick. "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

We have a beautiful instance of this importunity

in the case of Monica, who prayed incessantly for the conversion of her son, afterwards the great St. Augustine of Hippo.

In conclusion. If it be true that, as Miss Montgomery has said,

"Prayer is the burden of a sigh,
The falling of a tear,
The upward glancing of the eye,
When none but God is near."

that "calling always upon God" is a sign of real, genuine, vital religion, then, my brethren, what is our faith and practice in this great work on which so much depends? Are we, like Epaphras, "always labouring fervently" for others in prayers and supplications? Nay, are we following the example of our Blessed Master Himself, who said to St. Peter, surrounded as he was by dangers and temptations, "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not?" Oh, may each one of us in this Church to-day resolve that from henceforth we will be more earnest in our prayers not only for ourselves, but in the words of our Litany, "that it may please God to rule and govern His Holy Church universal in the right way, and to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived." And may He who heareth prayer enable us to cherish the motions of His Holy Spirit; that, whilst "looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God," we may, even now, obtain pardon and peace!

THE Archbishop of York and Mrs. Thomson, with their family, have gone to North Berwick, where they have taken Tantallion Lodge for a few weeks.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury is holiday-making at the Riffel Alp. The new Dean of Norwich is also at this his old resort, and is assisting the Primate in his mountaineering experiences.—*Yorkshire Post*.

It is stated that the Bishop of Durham, although not able as yet for diocesan work, is busily engaged with literary labours. He is preparing a very important article on the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, which is to be published in the *Expositor*.

THE Bishop of Southwell has appointed the Rev. Selwyn C. Freer, late Mission Curate of St. Catharine's, Nottingham, to be his Domestic Chaplain and Secretary in the place of Canon Were. His address is 6, Upper College-street, Nottingham.

AMONG the recruits to current journalism is Miss Helen Gladstone, whose articles deal with objects of special interest to women. She has special experience, having been for about ten years closely connected with Newnham College, Cambridge, first as a student, then as secretary to Mrs. Sidgwick, whom she subsequently succeeded as Vice-Principal.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY. IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C.B. HARNESSE, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation. **OBESITY IS CURED**, and will be cured, gratis and post free, on application to the

Medical Battery Company, Limited,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1889.

CANTANKEROUS CHURCHMEN.

HUMILITY should be, if not the greatest, certainly the most obvious of Christian virtues, and we have but to look back to the principal catastrophes in the history of the Church to find that the absence of humility and a proud self-assertion on the part of bodies of men or individuals has been a very prominent cause of such trouble. Nor do we feel any sympathy for those men who pride themselves on belonging to the extremes of either party of the Church, and who palpably think, if they do not say so, that all who do not believe exactly their own particular shibboleth are eternally lost. But though theoretically, it seems almost inconceivable for such men to exist, as a matter of experience their name is legion. Go where you will throughout the length and breadth of the habitable globe you are continually brought face to face with them—men who seem to have but one object in life, and that “to find fault with every one and everything”—men who can see no good in anything unless it happens by some strange accident to flatter their own profound vanity. For instance, we recently heard a clergyman belonging to this class say that it was very difficult for a Protestant to rise in the English army because of the enormous influence exerted by the Church of Rome over the superior officers, nor by any means could he be persuaded that his words were both an injustice to the Roman hierarchy and a libel on our British officers. Quite recently a gentleman was heard to say to one of the English chaplains abroad that he could not worship at the English service, inasmuch as the white cloth used for the Communion Service did not entirely

envelop the Communion table, and hence was after the Romish pattern; and how often do so-called Christians attack the sermons of some pious pastor, and seek to assure him that he is himself not a “converted man,” because he carefully avoids harping in *every* discourse on what is often called “The Gospel of Damnation?” On the other hand, we are frequently pained with the narrow vanity of men of another school of thought. “I think we had better not discuss these questions, I am sorry for you”—is not an unfrequent remark from the cynical lips of some youthful Ritualist or “poor Dissenter” in reference to some godly clergyman holding perhaps less advanced views. We once heard a clergyman in the south of London say that no clergyman *could* go to heaven who did not teach “The Real Presence” and “Habitual Confession.” We do not think that too strong measures are ever advisable; but we must say we should not be grieved to see the sad tragedy of the Kilkenny cats reiterated in the persons of those extreme gentlemen to whom we have referred. If this is not feasible we cannot help wishing that some consensus of opinion could be come to whereby the former class by being universally snubbed and avoided might be led to consider that they could not be permitted to abstract the little sweetness in life by their perpetual sourness; and we do believe that great good would be done if some of the latter class, by a properly organised system, could have a little manliness kicked into them. The process might not be pleasant, but we believe that there are many, whose names readily recur to one’s mind, who would be much better if they had the insipid effeminacy and the stupid stiffness horsewhipped out of them; and in these instances we are of opinion that the sanctity of the clerical person might be dispensed with. We are advised, however, that our suggestions are hardly likely to meet with universal approbation. We must therefore patiently await the results which progress of time effects.

Reviews and Notices.

“THE TIMES OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH AND ISRAEL.”
 By Professor Rawlinson. London: Nisbet & Co. Pp. 238.

THIS book is a valuable and instructive one; it combines the interests of the latest results of Oriental research with the otherwise somewhat confused details of that period, in such a manner, as to make the book alike a treat to the student as well as to the ordinary reader. It is written in a clear, concise, and interesting manner; the style is anything but prosy, and its graphic nature seems quite to transport the reader to the site of the events recorded. In most instances there is a whole chapter devoted to each king. We strongly recommend this volume to any who desire more light on the later historical books of the Old Testament.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—In replying to the letters in the PULPIT of this date, I will abstain entirely from personalities.

In my letter which appeared in the PULPIT of 20th July, I referred to the moral sensibilities as being important and indispensable auxiliaries to the intellectual faculties in judging of dogmas. Thereupon Mr. Donaldson charged my sensibilities with rebellion against revealed truth. I then explained that I did not mean my individual perceptions and feelings, but those generally prevalent, as shown by facts which I mentioned. He now says my sensibilities are not those of human nature.

I endeavoured to prove that the sensibilities of human nature have become far more tender and delicate in a benevolent sense, as compared with those that prevailed even a hundred years ago. The efforts against the Slave Trade in 1787 were met with great opposition and even personal violence, and its abolition was not effected until twenty years later. The Act to give freedom to the slaves in the British colonies was not carried until thirty years beyond that. Society, both high and low, viewed with serenity a bloody Criminal Code, the modification of which did not commence until 1808. Am I not justified in calling the ages that tolerated such enormities as being cruel? The still darker eras which gave us the harsh interpretations of the Bible under consideration were able to tolerate still more revolting cruelties.

My argument is, that the kindly changes in human feelings which the foregoing facts prove, are owing to the increased circulation of the Holy Scriptures. The blessed change is from God, and may assist us in a better comprehension of what is revealed concerning His own gracious purposes. The hard and dry intellect is not sufficient. The old interpretations are quite inconsistent with our more enlightened ideas as to the objects of Government, which we now consider to be the general welfare, and of the constituent elements of happiness which indispensibly include the satisfaction of kindly feelings. Any conception of heaven deficient in that respect must pass away.

I think I am justified in writing, because I have received encouragement to do so from intelligent clergymen and laymen. Besides, my opinions are substantially the same as those of the Bishop of Manchester, the Bishop of Argyll, Dean Plumtre, Archdeacon Farrar, Canon Fremantle, Canon Wilberforce, and many other Episcopalian and Dissenting clergy. I met with many persons in Ireland who held similar views.

In reply to the letter of Mr. Christie, I do not believe God is a Being of unmingled benevolence. At the same time, I do not believe justice requires endless misery. We need not give up blessedness without end, as there is an abundance of texts to assure us of it.

J. B.

Canonbury, 31st August, 1889.

SIR,—When "J. B." has been able to find out that "the devil is a creature of God," there is a hope, however faint, that he may yet discover that spirit's true place in the moral economy of the universe. In order thereto I would ask him kindly to notice that

Christ came to "destroy the devil" (Heb. ii. 14). The only other parts of the "intelligent creation" are the angels who never sinned, and men; the former have no need of a Saviour, consequently men *alone* are the objects of redemption.

The fire in 1 Cor. iii. 15 "*tries the work*," not purifies the person; and the man is saved by escaping from the fire, and escapes "so as by fire," that is, with difficulty. Besides, the Apostle is there speaking of those who are "building on Christ" *now*, not of the lost; and the fire is not *material*. The possibility of conceiving a thing is no proof of the existence of that thing. I can conceive "J. B." as a believer in everlasting punishment, but that does not alter his opposition to that doctrine. So he may conceive human pain coming to an end after a protracted period, but that does change the actual duration of the suffering. "Ultimate recovery" is impossible, because God has said so.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, 31st August, 1889.

COMPREHENSION.

SIR,—Church comprehension, of which you treat in your leading article of to-day, may be regarded either as the comprehension of a more varied range of religious doctrine and practice than is now admitted, or as the comprehension of a larger number of persons. In the article there is: "We admit no orders but Episcopalian. We re-ordain any coming with any other. This decides the point." There is here a slight error in the matter of fact. It is not the Church of England which by its law excludes from its ministry all persons of non-episcopal orders. The exclusion is the enactment of the second act of uniformity. During the century that succeeded the Reformation, ministers of Scotch, German, etc., orders were admissible without re-ordination to our cures of souls.

An alteration of the constitution of the Church of England, according to which such doctrines and practices as you reprobate in the article would be sanctioned, is not an alteration of the same nature as the abolition of one of the provisions of the act of uniformity would be. Indeed, such abolition would not be an alteration of the Church's constitution at all. While a comprehension, by way of altering the Church's body of doctrine, in even the smallest measure, is a thing full of danger, on the other hand a comprehension, by way of admitting new persons to the ministry, such as were admitted formerly, in one of the best ages of the Church is a thing eminently safe. The first alteration must almost certainly compromise Catholic truth; the second would be a Catholic act.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

24th August, 1889.

"EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION."

SIR,—"B." thinks that this is an "awkward" expression, but not "unreasonable" or "indefensible." He explains it thus: The Sacraments are "vehicles" through which "life" from Christ "reaches us." But "A. G. S." comes forth as the champion and spokesman of the Ritualistic party. He says "we mean;" "we use," etc. He is bolder and more outspoken

than "B." He gives us plainly the meaning of the phrase "Extension of the Incarnation." "In the Blessed Sacrament Christ still clothes Himself in material elements." In fact the Eucharist is, as some of the leaders of this party say, a "second Bethlehem." I find this teaching in a popular book called "A Prayer Book for the Young" (London: J. T. Hayes), page 321 (2nd edition), on "the Holy Communion:" "Oh how wonderful that God should love us to so great a degree as to conceal His glory, which fills the whole courts of heaven, under the mean and common forms of bread and wine, in order to *become our food*. He who once concealed His Godhead under the form of a poor and weak infant, obedient to His mother and St. Joseph, obedient to the laws of man and of nature, suffering hunger and cold, etc., now humbles Himself still more, hiding both His body and soul as well as His Godhead, under the forms of mere bread and wine; and is obedient to the priest, coming down at his word, remaining on the altar, and giving Himself to any who will so come, remaining silent and motionless," etc., etc. And then this teacher of the young proceeds with shameless effrontery to say, "Is not this wonderful? yet it is *true* for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it!" Where in the Holy Scripture did the Lord ever say that He would "hide" His body, soul and Godhead, under the forms of mere bread and wine? Where does He say that He will "come down" at the word of a priest? Will "A. G. S." tell us? He says we have this doctrine "from the Master"! At the Last Supper how did Christ clothe Himself in the material elements? Did He leave His cloak and other garments on the couch where He was reclining, and go into the bread and wine? Perhaps when we are "better informed" by "A. G. S." we shall be able to comprehend it! At present this so-called "extension of the Incarnation" appears to be nothing but "blasphemous fable"!

OXONIENSIS.

August 26th, 1888.

SIR,—I might rest satisfied with my friend Canon Dwyer's defence of my truth as to the fact, that the Evangelicals of Ireland, by their votes, struck out of this creed the necessity of "believing rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is a fact that their votes before me show, to their disgrace before the whole Christian world. Mr. Murphy says nothing about this. He keeps generally to what he calls "damnatory clauses." As if, in this category, were not included our Lord's own words, "Except ye believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins." I have no doubt that, when they began this onslaught on the faith, they had in view only such questions as the three in one, and the two natures, though even these assertions in the creed are only denials of vital heresies. But once they began with the broad idea that a man is not answerable for his creed, there was no stopping. I grant that, after striking out of the creed the Catholic belief in Christ, "starting at the sound themselves had made," they thought it better to leave the creed untouched, and only to banish it from the service as an out-of-date document. I thank you for this. It is better to say nothing than deny the faith.

But Mr. Murphy speaks of an understanding between the Broad and the Evangelicals to betray the faith. I never asserted anything of the kind. How could I know of it? Such transactions are kept in the

dark, if real, such as the Lichfield House and the Kilmainham treaties. Two parties may take the same course without a binding treaty. Thus did Herod, Pontius Pilate, and the Jews. This, I suppose, was the Liverpool case between Mr. Brierly and the object of the ladies' enthusiasm. Let it be so. There was no bargain that if the Broad consented to emasculate the Baptismal services, the Low would do the same with the Athanasian Creed. Be it so? How does the matter stand? The Evangelical, without any *quid pro quo*, voluntarily, and not urged by the Broad, consented to strike out the necessity of believing rightly the Incarnation. If they did this of their own *mero motu* their case is a bad one. But so Mr. Murphy will have it. Save me from my friends is an old prayer.

2. I now come to the other question on which I am challenged, "the extension of the Incarnation." "A. G. S." politely regrets that I am not better informed, and less prosaic, whatever this latter means. But I pass on. He makes assertions; that is all. "B." writes at more length, but there is nothing tangible. Of course we all know that, to our Lord's Incarnation, redemption and sanctification are due. But "extension of the Incarnation," what is that? We all have incarnation by birth. That is not owing to our Lord being born. The words can mean no more, or no less, than that our Lord's Body is joined to our's in the Eucharist. There is no scripture for this. The Church denies it in the 4th Article. What comes to us in the Eucharist is grace or spirit that quickeneth. The flesh profiteth nothing. The only truth that I can gather from "B." is that without His Incarnation He could not have given His flesh for the world. If this is all that is meant by the extension of His incarnation, it is *vox et preterea nihil*. If Wilberforce invented the phrase, it is worthy of one who soon went off to Rome. "Actual contact" is another expression from the same mint. What do we people want? Have we not our Lord, as Deity, present? Is there anything that He, as Deity, cannot confer? What avails an airy nothing, called substance, which people pretend is present under the elements? If the flesh profiteth nothing, that is the whole matter. Let us hear Newman's last utterance—"He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but sacramentally. His presence is substantial, spirit-wise, sacramental, not against reason, but against imagination, and must be received by faith." If this means more than a body, like the sun, acting at a distance, it is pure nonsense; and therefore nil against reason. It is against imagination indeed, because it is incomprehensible. It must be received by faith. How so, if it cannot be even imagined? It comes to this, "I believe, because it is what I know not."

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

SIR,—I am sorry to find that while your correspondent "A. G. S." chides another for being prosaic and ill-informed, he himself ascends no higher than materialism. Certainly not very ethereal or poetic, or yet learned. And what is his position on this so-called "Extension of the Incarnation"? "We mean that in the Blessed Sacrament He still clothes Himself in material elements." This is the point, where is the proof? He answers: "The elements which His Spirit quickens we call His Flesh and Blood as He

Himself did," adopting literally what He spoke figuratively. But can he reconcile it with Christ's other words? "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the *flesh* profiteth nothing; the words I spake *they are spirit* and *they are life*" (John vii. 63); and after He had said, "For my flesh is *meat* indeed, and my blood is *drink* indeed" (v. 55), what He meant by *meat* and *drink* He had already explained in chap. iv. 34. "My *meat* is to do the will of Him that sent me," and again (v. 32), "I have *meat* you know not of," that is, spiritual communion with the Father—nothing material, in all this.

Surely "A. G. S." should consider St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. v. 16: "Though we have known Christ *after the flesh*, yet now henceforth know we Him no more," and be admonished by that to the Galatians (iv. 9): "But now after that ye have known God, or rather known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage."

"B's" argument is hardly less tenable, there can be no medium explanation; either the words must be taken literally or figuratively. That as flesh and blood are the elements of this life, so communion with Christ is the essential of spiritual life, pure and simple.

A. G. B.

28th August, 1889.

SIR,—Will you be so kind as to allow me to make a few remarks upon a letter signed "A. G. S." in your edition of 24th ult. He seems to teach "The real carnal presence" of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. It is a very solemn subject to write upon, and should in my humble judgment be spoken of with a great deal more reverence than it is, and I may apply what an Apostle says on another subject to this. It is "intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." Should it not be admitted by all, that is, those who spiritually partake of the Lord's supper who are benefitted by it "to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls."

If our Blessed Lord spake of the sacrament which He was about to institute in chap. vi. of John's Gospel, and said "whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in Him." When some of our Lord's hearers understood these words *literally*, and were offended, did not our Lord explain to them His meaning in verses 62 and 63 of the same chapter. When our Lord appointed this sacrament in the other Gospels, did His disciples partake of it in a *carnal* manner? Did He not call it "the fruit of the wine"? Matthew xxiv. 29, Mark xiv. 25, Luke xxii. 18. I would desire to see these questions answered.

J. S. RUBY.

The Rectory, Murragh, Bandon,
28th August, 1889.

P. S.—What advantage have those who partake of the Lord's Supper believing in a carnal presence, more than those who spiritually feed on Christ in humble and true penitence, and in faith and love?

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barnes, the Ven. Archdeacon, Canon of Exeter Cathedral.
Black, Rev. James, Chaplain to the *Impregnable*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Royal Adelaide*.
Blake, Rev. George Leigh, Chaplain to the *Asia*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Crocodile*.

Blakiston, Rev. Charles Dendy, M.A., formerly Vicar of Linslade, Leighton Buzzard; Vicar of Exwick, Exeter.
Brabazon, Rev. John, Chaplain to the *Immortalité*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Excellent*.
Davis, Rev. Edward, Curate-in-Charge of St. Aubyn's, Devonport; Vicar of Chevithorne, Tiverton.
Edmonds, Rev. Prebendary, B.D., Rector of High Bray, South Molton; Vicar of St. George's, Tiverton.
Eliot, Rev. Philip Herbert, Curate of Portsea; Vicar of Winslow, Bucks.
Evans, Rev. Richard, Rector of Whittering.
Farrar, Rev. Augustus Edward, Chaplain of Berks County Asylum, Moulshford.
Freer, Rev. Selwyn C., late Mission Curate of St. Catharine's, Nottingham; Domestic Chaplain and Secretary to the Bishop of Southwell.
Gregory, Rev. Edmund Ironside, Vicar of Halberton; Prebendary in Exeter Cathedral.
Harris, Rev. William Stuart, Chaplain to the *Inconstant*; Chaplain to the *Iron Duke*.
Horton, Rev. Robert, Curate of Leominster; Vicar of Irvington, Herefordshire.
Jones, Rev. David Saunders, Curate of St. John's and St. Mary's, Brecon; Rector of Llanfrynach, Breconshire.
Kenah, Rev. Samuel, Chaplain to the *St. Vincent*; Chaplain to the Artillery Division at Portsmouth.
Matthews, Rev. Frederick J., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Iron Duke*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Duke of Wellington*.
Methven, Rev. David, Curate-in-Charge of Fishlake, York; Vicar of Earls Colne.
Newton, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Shepley, Huddersfield; Vicar of Barnstaple.
Nicolls, Rev. Alexander, Chaplain to the *Duke of Wellington*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *St. Vincent*.
Norton, Rev. Thomas F., Chaplain to the Portsmouth Division of Royal Marines.
Oxland, Rev. William, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Active*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Impregnable*.
Pulleyn, Rev. J. W., Vicar of Barnstaple; Vicar of Shepley, Huddersfield.
Rudderford, Rev. Dr., Chaplain of the Portsmouth Division of the Royal Marines; Vicar of Alston-with-Garrigill.
Sands, Rev. Hubert, M.A., Curate of Moseley; Charge of the newly-constituted District of St. Oswald, Bordesley, Birmingham.
Scott, Rev. Percy R., Vicar of St. George's, Stonehouse; Prebendary in Exeter Cathedral.
Spawforth, Rev. James, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Great Grimsby; Rector of South Ferryby.
Stebbing, Rev. Frank Cole, Chaplain to the *Excellent*; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Active*.
Stewart, Rev. Edward Hamilton, M.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Auckland; Incumbent of the newly-constituted District of St. Aidan's, Gateshead.
Walter, Rev. Henry Major, M.A., Vicar of Wentworth Holy Trinity, Rotherham.
White, Rev. John, Vicar of Dacre, Penrith; Vicar of Stockton-on-Tees.
Woodman, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Stockton-on-Tees; Vicar of Dacre, Penrith.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alexander, Rev. Harvey, B.A., for thirty-five years Rector of the parish, at Stoke Rivers Rectory, Barnstaple, on the 27th ult., aged 66.
Boyce, Rev. J. C., at Cornwell Rectory, Chipping Norton, on the 21st ult., aged 62.
Evans, Rev. Benjamin, for forty-six years Vicar of Llanstephan, at the Vicarage, Llanstephan, on the 25th ult., aged 89.
Goodday, Rev. James, many years Vicar of Terling, Essex, at Harold Wood, on the 1st inst., aged 65.
Hodgson, Rev. Stanley, Vicar of the parish, sometime Head Master of the Bolton Grammar-school, at St. Paul's Vicarage, Halliwell, Bolton, on the 31st ult., in the 73rd year of his age.
Voules, Rev. Tom Arthur, M.A., Oxon, for forty years Rector of Beer Crocombe and North and South Bradon, on the 26th ult., aged 74.



The Church of England Pulpit.

"THE ACCEPTABLE OFFERING."

BY THE LORD BISHOP OF CORK, AT THE ANNUAL
CHOIR FESTIVAL.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. CANICE CATHEDRAL,
KILKENNY, ST. JAMES' DAY, 1889.

"Give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name; bring an offering and come into His courts."—Ps. xcvi. 8.

PROBABLY the Prayer Book version of this text is more familiar to many—"Ascribe unto the Lord the honour due unto His name, bring presents and come into His courts." The rendering in either version suggests to our minds the true spirit of the service in which we are engaged to-day. You have come from many a distant parish, the members of many choirs, to this ancient temple of God, to take part in this noble service. It is to me peculiarly gratifying to observe the order of this assemblage, and to recognise the spirit in which the service is conducted. It seems to me that there are two things that are absolutely essential to the success and usefulness of such a gathering of choirs as that in which we now take part. The first of these is that the selection of the music which is to be practised and sung should be judicious, that it shall be such as shall be suitable for such a service, and the practice of which will be useful and helpful to the different choirs in leading the services in their own parish churches. The second point which is essential is this, that when the music is selected it should be carefully practised, and should be then rendered with care, precision and devotion. I speak only words of simple truth when I say that these conditions are fulfilled to-day. Nothing could exceed the judiciousness of the selection of the music which was appointed for you to sing, and the precision and care with which that has been rendered is admirable, I have no doubt it is the feeling of all who are here that such music may fitly express the worship of God in spirit and in truth. The words which I have selected to speak to you upon suggest to us two thoughts: first, we are told to give unto God the glory due unto His name. The idea which we have of God must influence all the feelings we have towards God, and all the worship which we offer to God. As we think of Him, so will we worship Him; and according to the idea which

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 716.

we have of His greatness, and glory, and goodness, so will be our feelings towards Him. This thought seemed to come with power upon the mind of the Apostle Paul, when he stood on Mars' Hill in the centre of the cultivation and of the idolatrous worship of the old world. When he saw that the city was wholly given unto idolatry his spirit was stirred within him, and he took advantage of the inscription which he saw on an altar there, erected on account of a pestilence that had lately swept over the city—the altar to an unknown God. From that text he spoke to the cultivated Athenian idolaters of the unity, of the existence, of the power and majesty of God. He accepted the idea that they would offer up their worship to the true God, and then he told them what His nature was: how He made the earth and the heavens and all things around, and he would tell them that, as some of their own poets had expressed it, "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." As we think of the worship of the ancient world we see that the ancient in his simplicity imagined that he heard the voice of God in every utterance of nature. In every action and function of nature he saw the action or heard the voice of a Deity. Modern thought, the thought which has resulted from the study of science, the thought which has resulted from the cultivation of all the arts, and the increase of civilization, would expel altogether from the minds of men the idea of the action and providence of God. Men, imagining that they have been able to pry into the secrets of nature; men feeling that they can find out some little thing about the great laws that govern the universe, would imagine from this that they are right in their conclusion that all is as the working of some great machine—that no presiding mind rules, controls and governs it. Thus modern thought would endeavour to make religion in every place, and in every mind, and in every life a thing of secondary importance, and gradually expel it from its influence over man, and ultimately silence its voice altogether. Yet we know that the more exhaustively we study the different portions of nature, and compare them one with the other, the more perfect, and complete, and unanswerable is the proof that is presented to any reasonable mind, not only of the existence but also of the action and government of God Who rules over all. If we were looking at the progress of some great piece of work, if we were to study, for instance, the making of some railroad in a difficult country, or the building of some large and elaborate bridge over a chasm or over a river, and if we were to watch the progress of that work going on in different parts and in different places, and we saw that when the parts came together each fitted to the other, and that in the one there was preparation made for the other when completed, what conclusion could any reasonable man come to but this, that the whole work, though separately commenced, was governed and controlled and

designed by one presiding mind? Now it is open to any one of us, though our resources and education may be limited, it is open to any of us to see all around us in the fields abundant proofs of this kind of the existence and government of God. You are all familiar with the little gall-nut which grows upon the oak tree. I venture to think that there is not a boy in this assembly who has not pulled it off and used his penknife to see what was in the interior of that little nut, and if we look at it there is in it one of the most wondrous proofs of the government and control of God Who rules over all. We see in many cases that the little insect has certain instincts, which lead it to provide for its young, but in this case we see that the provision takes place in another kingdom of nature. We see the oak tree in its growth providing for the life of the little insect. The little fly lays her egg, and then rasps and rubs the portion of the tree, after which she puts upon it an acid with some strange power, and leaves the egg there. There is a growth, not natural but abnormal, not the same as the other growths of the oak tree, but different altogether from them; the nut grows round the little seed of life, forms a bed for it, and forms food and protection for it. Thus, we see clearly a proof of the government of the great controlling Mind, Who cares even for the least thing in creation, and provides for its life and for its growth. My dear friends, it is the mystery of life that baffles all the explanations of science. The dissecting knife cannot find it, but yet it can destroy it. Learned men can reason about it, and can tell of its existence, but they cannot produce it. It is from God it comes, and from God alone. If we do not hold this truth as one of the rocks on which our faith is planted, that it is God Who giveth life, and that God it is who sustains it, we plant our footsteps on the quicksand, and we have no foundation whereon we can rest or be at ease. We come back then to the declaration of the Apostle in that passage to which I have alluded, where he said—"In Him we live, and move, and have our being." Christian friends, as you assemble in this temple to-day, as you bring your offering and come into the courts of God, do you not know this, that there are hundreds and thousands among us who live as if there were no God at all? The Psalmist in his anger exclaimed, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God;" but in these days of knowledge, and progress, and science and civilization, we must admit that there are hundreds and thousands around us who live at all events, as if there were no God. They acknowledge Him not, and they know Him not. But God, in His word, calls upon us over and over again, and so, in the language of our text, not only to acknowledge His existence, but to bring an offering, and to come into His courts, and to give Him worship. What offering do you

bring to Him to-day? You have come into the courts of the Lord; you have brought an offering to Him. Yes, you have brought Him the offering of the lips—very pleasing to hear, very pleasing to you to offer. What is its value? What makes it valuable? Let us look at it for a moment and ask what makes an offering of the lips a valuable offering unto the Lord. Look at the history of the offerings which were offered unto God. We read in the earliest book of Scripture of the offering of old, when Cain made his offering and Abel his; the offering of Cain was rejected because it was not offered in faith, and because he did not offer up the victim which was the type of the great coming Sacrifice. Then years afterwards Abraham presented an offering unto God; he would offer his only son, he was willing to obey the command of God, and take the life of the son of promise. But his hand was stayed; the offering of an only son was not yet to be made. It was the blood of slain beasts that was to flow upon the Jewish altar for a time, and then, at last, when the fulness of time was come, the Great Offering for the sins of men was made upon the Cross on Calvary, when God gave His only Son to die for the sins of men. When the Lord was on earth, when He contemplated His own death as He stood, as it were, in the shadow of the Cross, He looked beyond the Cross, and He said: "I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me." What was to be the power, what was to be the secret which would make the death of Christ of such mighty power and influence that it would draw all men unto Him—that it would have influence over the hearts of men such as never any other event in the history of the human family had? It was this—that the Lord offered up Himself. And as we read the story of the Cross we see that this was what made the offering acceptable with God and powerful with men, that He offered up Himself. We are assembled to-day in the name of Christ; and as you read the history of the Church of Christ, from the days of the Apostles onward through its varying and chequered course, you will find that the offering up of self, the giving of self, and the denial of self, for Christ's sake, is the great secret of all religious work, of all really useful work in Christ's name, and it is the secret of every acceptable offering unto God. And therefore it is, my dear friends, when you come into this temple, and when on the Sundays in your own churches you would lead the service of God, that which will render your offering an acceptable offering, that which can only make it pleasing in the sight of God, is that self should be given up, and that in that offering there should be the sacrifice and the giving up of self. Therefore, let me say in plain words of earnest love to those who lead the services of God in their different churches, that the choir is no place for self-display; the choir is no place

for the display of voice, of gifts, or personal excellence; the choir is the place for self-sacrifice, for the giving up of self, and for offering what we can offer in that spirit unto God. As that spirit is among us to-day, so will the offering of our lips be acceptable unto Him into whose courts we have come. I know, my friends, it is a difficult thing, it is often a wearisome thing, it is often a tedious and toilsome thing to be in your places Sunday after Sunday, fair weather or foul, whether the distance be long or short, whether the hour be convenient or inconvenient; it is a difficult thing, and often a tedious and toilsome thing, where, perhaps, the numbers of the congregation are small, to be in your places to lead the service of God. But, my friends, it is as we can get rid of all feeling of self; it is as we can do it for Christ's sake; as we can do it for the honour of His Name; it is then, and then only, that it is an acceptable offering unto Him. Dear friends, it is the same with us to-day. Jesus said, "If any man will save his life he shall lose it, and if any man will lose his life for My sake he shall find it." And it is as we come into His courts this day, as we bring our offering unto God, as we can give ourselves to Christ, and as we can forget all of selfish exultation and selfish display, that our offering will be acceptable unto Him. And so, my brethren, will the notes of your song of praise to-day be in perfect harmony with the notes of the great choir of Heaven, and be acceptable music to the King of kings and Lord of lords. May God grant unto all the excellence of this spirit from day to day and from year to year.

THE END OF ALL RITUAL.

BY THE REV. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., VICAR
OF ST. LUKE'S, CHADDERTON, OLDHAM.

SERMON PREACHED AT ST. LUKE'S CHADDERTON,
ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 4TH, 1889.

"What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."—
MICAH vi. 8 (part).

TWO very great prophets lived and prophesied about the same time, Isaiah and Micah. In many respects the messages they delivered were the same, and had the same ends and purposes in view. The principal differences between them are, that Isaiah, being not only a preacher but also a statesman, takes views wider and more comprehensive than Micah's, telling of God's dealings with other nations as well as with Israel, and declaring their burden or fate; while the prophet Micah speaks more plainly for the people. Many of Isaiah's prophecies are really political speeches—political, I mean, in the correct sense of the word—not at all in the modern misleading

sense; many of Micah's are more like what a sermon should be. Yet, in spite of these differences, both have really the same message to deliver, and that message is in the main, to declare the righteousness of the Lord. In the days of Isaiah and Micah, that is in the days when Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah were kings of Judah, there was indeed plenty of righteousness of a sort. Jotham, we read, was a good king, and certainly Hezekiah was; Ahaz was one of those kings of whom one always wishes to know more. He was a bad man, but not a weak man; he was victorious over his enemies, and he made the priests obey his wishes. He even compelled Urijah, the High Priest, the friend of Isaiah, to set up an altar copied from one at Damascus, to which the king displayed an extraordinary reverence, sacrificing before it himself, morning and evening, with all the royal state of the ancient sacrifices. The Temple lent itself to a mixed worship, partly of Jehovah, partly of Eastern idols, while outside it idolatry flourished unchecked — so greatly increasing that the people were alarmed, and their fears helped to prepare the way for Hezekiah's reforms. Very sweeping were those reforms. Not only were the idols destroyed, but even those ancient altars where patriarchs and kings had in bygone ages worshipped without rebuke, were overthrown, and the national worship was confined to the Temple. That sacred serpent which Moses had made, was contemptuously thrown aside as a mere piece of brass. The feast of the Passover was kept in a way that it never had been since the days of Joshua. Even the inhabitants of the idolatrous kingdom of Israel attended at Jerusalem. All that a reforming king could do, Hezekiah did; but the heart of the nation was unsound, and so long as this is so, all reforms, whether by kings or lawgivers, or priests or people, are but as the making clean the outside of the cup and the platter—Hezekiah did this much but he could do more, and the nation got no nearer to the righteousness of the Lord. The prophets Isaiah and Micah saw that it was so; the great duty of a prophet or preacher is to look *below* the surface to realities; and they spoke very plainly. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord; I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs, or of he-goats. Your new moons and your sabbaths my soul hateth, I am weary to bear them. Wash you; make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

That was Isaiah's message, and Micah's testimony is the same concerning the righteousness of the Lord. "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the High God? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with

calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil; shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shown thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

Yet let us fully understand this. Neither Micah nor Isaiah, when they thus testified of the righteousness of the Lord, had the slightest wish to abolish the temple services. They were religious reformers, not destructives. They never taught that temple services were useless; very far from it. What they most emphatically taught was this—that heartless, formal, faithless sacrifices, offered by godless and worldly worshippers, are utterly useless, and worse than useless. They taught that sacrifices, oblations, temple services and the like, are not religious ends, but religious means, whereby the faithful worshipper may gain grace and get new strength to observe and do the true righteousness of the Lord. God did not want thousands of rams or ten thousand of rivers of oil—every beast of the field is His, and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills. God required that men should render to Him that which sacrifices and offerings were all alike designed to teach—justice, mercy, humility.

And does not the same lesson still need to be enforced? Yes, indeed it does. For our times are very like, *painfully* like, the times when Isaiah and Micah prophesied; there is now, as there was then, abundant wealth, abundant luxury, abundant forms and ceremonies; but what increase is there of justice, mercy and humility, those qualities which God above all requires? No doubt we much prefer to think there is, and we turn away from the warning that much of our boasted progress is utterly hollow and unreal; the people of Jerusalem scoffed at Isaiah's denunciations, we read; they were too plain spoken; they did not agree with the popular tone, and so they were not listened to. Nor do men ever like to be warned against trusting in the correct observance of ritual and ceremony, and told to seek after a more real righteousness. In the human heart there is always a tendency to choose the easy and avoid the difficult; very much more easy is it to perform with due at-

tion outward rites and ceremonies than to exercise ourselves in all things to have a conscience void of offence both towards God and man. And therefore we also need the warning voice which calls us to self-examination and heart-searching, and which asks, Are we really growing in goodness, not stopping at any formal use of the means of grace but gaining the grace itself; not content with our forms and ceremonies, however needful, but learning the lessons those forms and ceremonies are designed to teach? For just as the Jews in the days of Isaiah and Micah the prophets, and of Hezekiah the king, neglected to learn from their

rites and ceremonies, to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly with God; so we also, in spite of our revived ceremonies and our increased Church-going, may yet far too easily fail to learn the lessons taught in our own Church services.

It is far easier, for instance, to trust in the fact that we have been baptised into the Christian Church, and been made thereby members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, than it is to learn that lesson our Church tells us baptism is designed to teach, that *golden* lesson—I would it were read Sunday after Sunday instead of only at the Baptismal Service; "remembering always that baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him; that as He died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptised die to sin and rise again to righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living." To follow Christ's example — to die to sin — to live righteous lives; that, and not the outward sprinkling of water — the mere putting away of the filth of the flesh — is what baptism should teach; our baptismal service is like an echo of Micah's words, not thousands of rams nor ten thousands of rivers of oil can avail, but one thing only God asks for, the broken and penitent heart, since all who repent and believe, in the glad news of mercy have part.

And that greatest of all means of grace, the Holy Communion—which so many neglect in a way which is most sad and mournful, and which would surprise, if anything we men and women do in this strange world ever surprised—what is *that* designed to teach. What is the lesson conveyed with the Sacramental signs of the presence of Christ—of His Body given for us, and His Blood shed for us. Those words "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful,"—what do they teach — teach, I mean, not for meditation on a deep mystery, but for daily practical life? Surely they teach a lesson which reaches down to the very roots of religion, and rises upwards to all the varied activities of life. In remembrance that Christ died;—then we also must learn to die with Him, and rise again to a new life—to a citizenship in heaven—to a life hid with Christ in God. Feed on Him in thy heart;—if the door of the heart be kept open, Christ by the Holy Spirit will remain therein—a very real Presence indeed *there*—and by that indwelling presence the heart shall be renewed, and we shall go from grace to grace and from strength to strength. Is it not again an echo of Micah's words; not thousands of rams or ten thousands of rivers of oil—for the flesh profiteth nothing—but to do justly and to love mercy and to

walk humbly with our God? It is strange how many wholly neglect the most simple, but when properly prepared for, most helpful Sacrament of the Supper of the Lord; it is *not* strange that because of such neglect, many calling themselves Christians amongst us are weak and feeble, and many utterly faint-hearted.

And our Sunday services, what are they for? Not that a man may come, and then return home satisfied with himself for a duty done. Rather the contrary; let him go home dissatisfied with himself for past duties left undone. We come to Church to confess our sins, to pray, to give thanks, to gain that strength, help, and comfort which we need for the daily duties of daily life. To what purpose is it all unless we are heartily sorry; unless prayer for amendment is followed by the work of amendment, and unless we show forth our thankfulness, not with our lips only, but in our lives, by giving up ourselves to God's service, and by walking before Him in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life?

Prayer and thanksgiving—what privilege can be greater than that of meeting here to join therein, if only it be rightly used? But if such privilege sink down into a formal ceremony, what doth it profit? God requires of us not Church service only; He requires heart service, life service, service of thought, of word, of deed. He requires that we come to the courts of His house; that there we may learn to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly.

They are not easy virtues to learn; very far from it. To do justly, that is perhaps hardest of all. So great a virtue is justice, that in popular opinion it is hardly a virtue at all. Men are praised for kindness, generosity, consistency, and the like, scarcely ever for justice. To be just requires thoughtfulness, patience, forbearance, unselfishness, all these in a world of misunderstandings, haste, passion, party spirit, idleness, and folly. Justice is the least popular of virtues, men seldom strive to attain unto it.

And to love mercy—not so difficult perhaps as to do justly, but still quite hard enough. For true mercy requires strength and firmness—the weak are almost always cruel; and strength and firmness are qualities that come very slowly and very gradually, by much self-discipline, and by exceeding much wrestling alone with God in prayer.

And who can walk humbly with God? He and he only who has caught something of the spirit of Jesus, and knows what is the mind of Christ because he denies himself daily, and daily takes up his cross, and daily follows the Saviour.

It is announced that the Rev. C. E. Newcomb, one of the curates of St. George's, Kidderminster, has offered to build for that parish a Mission Church, capable of holding 500 persons.

CHRISTIAN DUTIES IN PERILOUS TIMES.

NO. VI.—FIDELITY IN PERIL.

BY THE REV. E. A. COOKE, VICAR OF ATTLEBOROUGH, NUNEATON; AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE OF S. COLUMBA."

COURSE OF SIX SERMONS PREACHED DURING LENT, 1889, AT ATTLEBOROUGH.

"Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life."—REV. ii. 10.

THE Church to which the words of our text were addressed was that of Smyrna, an ancient commercial city in Asia Minor, at the mouth of the River Meles. Like many other great cities, it has had its vicissitudes, for, having been destroyed by the Lydians and lying in ruins for nearly 400 years, it was rebuilt by Alexander the Great near the original site. It is now a flourishing city of 120,000 inhabitants, of whom about 15,000 are Christians. We are not told with any degree of accuracy as to when the first planting of the Church of Smyrna took place, but we learn from Early Church history that in the infancy of the Church, persecution raged with great violence in Asia Minor, and that Smyrna was a special scene of Christian martyrdom.

It is generally believed that, when the Book of Revelation was written, the bishop or "angel" of the Smyranean Church was Polycarp—the aged disciple of St. John—who, rather than deny his Master Christ, perished on the scaffold, having made that noble confession which has sounded through all the ages: "Eighty and six years have I served my Lord Christ, and He has never offended me. How can I blaspheme my King, my Saviour?"

There is extant a letter of the Church of Smyrna, written by Ignatius, which describes the persecution of the Christians under the Antonines in A.D. 167: "Who would not marvel at their noble patience and love of their Master? Who endured to have their flesh torn with scourges so cruelly as to call forth the pity of them who stood by, while they refrained from uttering a cry or groan, showing to us all that the martyrs of Christ at that hour of torture were absent from the body, or rather that Christ was present with them; and giving heed to His favour, they despised earthly torment, purchasing by the sufferings of one hour an eternal reward. And the fire of their ruthless tormentors for them lost its power of burning, for they were thinking of escaping the eternal fire that shall never be quenched, and they were looking with the eyes of their heart to the good things reserved for such as suffer patiently, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath the heart of man conceived."

Perhaps the most striking passage in the epistle

is that with which Ignatius warns the people against, and shatters the heretical gospel of, the Docetæ, who taught that our Lord did not really and truly suffer, thereby denying the Atonement and the hope of a blessed resurrection. "If the life of the Lord was only lived in appearance, then I too am bound only in appearance. Why, I ask, why have I given myself over to death, to fire, to the sword? Surely because the nearer I am to the sword the nearer to God. In the jaws of the wild beasts I find myself in God. And this only in the name of Christ Jesus, that I may share in suffering, enduring all things through the strengthening grace of Him who has been made the Perfect Man." And in the letter to Polycarp himself (also written by Ignatius) we have a complete picture of pastoral wisdom and integrity. After the usual salutation, he says: "I exhort you by the grace with which thou art clothed to apply yourself more and more to thy course of duty. Vindicate your office in all care, both of flesh and spirit. Think over the unity than which nothing is better; raise and bear all men as the Lord does you; suffer all in love, even as you do; secure time for prayer; ask for greater sagacity than you now possess; watch with a sleepless spirit; bear all men's sicknesses as a perfect champion; where the labour is great the reward is large. The time requires you, as pilots ask for a wind, and as the storm-tossed ask for a haven, so that God may be won." He further tells him to stand "firm as an anvil against those who seem trustworthy, and yet teach strangely. The great athlete may be fagged, and yet he will conquer. Study the times, looking for Him, who is, above all time, the Eternal, the Invisible, who for our sakes became visible; the Intangible, the Passionless, who for our sakes suffered, for our sakes went through all manner of endurance."

Although the sufferings of pious Bishop Polycarp were of brief duration, it was the prelude to greater sufferings of his flock, in prospect of which the Church was to be prepared. "The devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall suffer persecution ten days." In the case of the Smyrnan Church we have a fair sample of those vicissitudes through which the various Christian churches passed during a long period of trouble; and the messages conveyed through the seer were intended to revive their languishing spirits, but at the same time to warn them against probable dangers. The Church of Ephesus is commended for diligence, but she fell from grace; Pergamos was faithful in days of persecution, but was disgraced by many sinful failures; Thyatira is accused of heresy; Sardis, which seemed sound in creed, is charged with hypocrisy and declension in religion; Philadelphia is encouraged for her faithfulness, but was outwardly weak; the Laodiceans were lukewarm, and therefore without earnestness. Perhaps the most encouraging message is that to the Church of Smyrna, which is sympathised with

in its poverty and tribulation, and assured of the victory and reward for those who are "faithful unto death." Whilst many of the warnings and admonitions contained in these epistles had appropriate reference to the churches to which they were addressed, the various branches of the Church Catholic may each find a message of warning, for few can look over Christendom as it is at present and not see the same evils, divisions, and heresies which were prevalent in the Seven Churches of Asia. Now, I wish you to observe in the first place that our text reminds us of the solemn fact that just as a runner in a race may start well, but never reach the goal, we may enter upon the race of life with the most anxious and earnest desire to run well, but, not casting every weight aside and the sins which beset us, we are sorely let and hindered, and "the prize" is not won.

The subject presents us with two distinct heads for our consideration.

First, there is a solemn call, "Be thou faithful unto death"; and, secondly, a grand reward, "and I will give thee a crown of life." The call is to faithfulness, "Be thou *faithful*." I need scarcely say that this is a quality required of all, whether in the discharge of those duties connected with our every-day calling, or the staunch adherence to, and acting out of, those principles of religion which we promised to keep inviolate. Faithfulness, even in the "few things" of worldly interest, rarely loses its reward. How much more brightly does it shine when tried in the fire of persecution, or when the great truths as revealed in Scripture are involved. Such was the faithfulness in which the Smyrneans were exhorted to continue if they would win the prize. Our Saviour speaks of this kind of faithfulness in the parable of the Sower: "He that receiveth the seed into stony places (the shallow heart—one without any depth), the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it." He assents to it, and makes an outward profession of it; but having no root in himself—no fixed resolutions and convictions—he endureth for a little while only, for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by-and-by he stumbles, the garb of profession falls off, and the real character is seen. Such an one has certainly not continued in the faith grounded and settled.

Observe the individuality of the call, "Be *thou* faithful." The commands and calls of God are so plain and numerous, it is quite impossible for any of us to escape. In all God's dealings with mankind generally the individual is not lost sight of in the crowd, and thus in its personal application the pronoun *thou* in our text is very emphatic. When Peter was curious as to our Lord's purposes for the other disciples, he was met with the quick but gentle rebuke: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow *thou* Me." The safety of the ninety and nine sheep was no compensation for the loss of the one in the

wilderness, nor was the security of the nine pieces of silver any compensation for the one out of God's circulation. So, also, in calling us to work, God speaks to us individually, and holds us responsible for the good we might have done. He places within our reach the means whereby we may do His work—the poor to be relieved, the sick and dying to be comforted, weak characters to be made strong, and sufferings for His sake to be endured. But whilst He calls us to achievement and advancement in the face of apparently insurmountable difficulties, He gives us the encouraging word, “Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer. Do not despair of reaching the goal, only let your chief care be to continue faithful, and thou shalt win the prize.”

Look, in the next place, at the great reward which the Author of our salvation holds out to those who are faithful unto death. “I will give thee a crown of life.” Why is the Christian's final prize represented here and elsewhere as a “crown”? Because it is the symbol of a faithful, and, therefore, a successful contest, and the appropriate badge of royalty. It is a term frequently used in Holy Scripture, and especially in St. Paul's Epistles. You remember, for instance, how the great Apostle says of the Phillippians that they were his “joy and crown”; that is, having been the means of their conversion, they were the great ornament of his ministry. Under the same image he likewise uses it for reward, that, just as conquerors in the public games were crowned, so his converts were bidden to strive earnestly for the “crown of life.” It is not extravagant to suppose that when St. Paul used the figure the great Isthmean games were uppermost in his mind, and were, therefore, suggestive of religious thought. Some of these games consisted in races, and it is to those St. Paul alludes when he writes to the Corinthians: “Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run that ye may obtain.” So, in like manner, the crown of eternal life is not for every one who merely enters the spiritual race, but only for those *who run well* “Now they do it,” says St. Paul, referring to the wrestlers in those games “to obtain a corruptible crown—a garland of fading leaves—but we an incorruptible.” “Oh, my brethren, what conflict too severe to be engaged in, what hardness too great to endure, in order to win such a prize! What is the most beautiful crown worn by sovereign princes, even though it be studded with the most precious rubies and diamonds, compared with that unfading, imperishable crown reserved in heaven for those who are being kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation! What is all the applause of the populace which is, like the world that gives it, transitory, compared with the “Well done! good and faithful servant,” which shall not die away, but live on for ever and ever, sustained by the loud hallelujahs of the skies, in which the

very angels of heaven shall join! St. Paul lived in the prospect of this reward when he wrote to Timothy: “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.” St. James tells those to whom he writes that he who holds out, or continues steadfast under tribulation, shall receive the crown of life. And St. Peter exhorts the elders to feed the flock of God over whom they were placed, and that they would receive, as a recompense for their untiring labour, a “crown of glory” from the Chief Shepherd's own hand.

There is a very beautiful and suggestive point which St. Augustine supplies in connection with our subject. “God” he says “does not look upon us when striving in the heavenward race as the people looked at their champions in the arena. For the populace encourage their champion with their cries, but cannot help him on. The man who proclaims the contest may provide the crown, but cannot supply vigour to the runner; but God, when He beholds us striving, assists us in the conflict.”

But there is one more thought which this metaphor naturally suggests, and which is, after all, the chief part of the spiritual conflict. Every candidate in the race was required to undergo all necessary preparations, which consisted of hard work, moderation in eating and drinking, and fasting, in fact, he was obliged to submit to a severe training such as was necessary to ensure success. This metaphor is, therefore, a fit image of that preparation which is essential to our future blessedness—the reward of him who has striven in the matches, and who has by earnest and frequent prayer trained his body by all manner of self-restraint, and made it the unreluctant instrument of the spirit. It is to help us to do this our Church, in her wisdom, has set apart this Lenten period of self-examination and self-discipline, for a more thorough searching of heart, a more decided renunciation of what the world calls lawful pleasures, and a re-consecration of ourselves, body, soul, and spirit, to our blessed Master. May it be such a season to us! Thus we shall be able, whilst beset and surrounded by private trials or ministerial difficulties, to follow the leading of the Holy Spirit. Oh, may we be faithful to Him—faithful when the storms blow, faithful when the sunshine falls, holding fast to Him through evil report and good report, in quiet dependence on the unfailing promise, “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.”

A LONDON stockbroker is restoring the church of Woldingham, near Caterham. Excepting that in the Isle of Wight, it is probably the smallest church in England, being only 30 feet by 20 feet.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary
 Affections can be
 immediately re-
 lieved and rapidly
CURED
 by simply
 using
 the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR
 THE
Voice,
Throat,
Chest,
and Lungs.

21s. post free.
 WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by
 the Royal Family, and principal
 Physicians, Clergymen,
 Vocalists, and Public Speakers
 throughout the country. New illus-
 trated Pamphlet with copies of Thou-
 sands of Testimonials
 may be had
 on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

FREE OF CHARGE

Corner of Rabbittone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1889.

GOING AHEAD TOO FAST.

IN a recent article we brought under the notice of our readers the shamefully neglected condition of the sanitary arrangements in rural labourers' cottages, which is, there is every reason to believe, the rule and not the exception in many parts of the country. We are glad to know that in more than one instance our remarks led to the inspection and removal of local nuisances. This week we desire to protest against the like state of things which threaten our rising centres of population to a much greater extent. It is astonishing what an impetus is given to building of a certain class by the opening-up of new industries in our quiet country villages. We must not imagine that the dwellers in our decaying towns have all found their way to London or other large hives, or even that they have emigrated to a foreign country. The decadence of an old often means the formation of a new town at some spot better adapted to the labour requirements of to-day than the ancient market borough. What was till within the last few years an unnoticed village often becomes suddenly transformed into a busy seat of labour, and the factory hands come thronging in at the prospect of work, and have to bespeak their houses before they are built, herding together in the meanwhile as best they may. Here, then, is a grand field for the Jerry-builder. He is given *carte blanche*, and all goes swimmingly inside and out of the new "houses," workshops, and factories, until suddenly the danger signal is hoisted. The outraged laws of health and decency demand satisfaction, and epidemics, with fatal cases of typhoid to emphasise

them, strike terror amongst the constantly increasing inhabitants. They have gone ahead too fast. What a change has been wrought! The old tenements have made way for modern stuccoed erections and staring rows of red brick walls. When those who had been absent from their native place for a few years chanced to revisit it they were puzzled and discomfited to find all the well-known land-marks removed, except, perhaps, a house or two here and there upon which the mark of the speculative building society was already set, and the ancient parish church, whose lofty spire rises in stately dignity above the high-storied workshops and their adjacent lines of streets set up by the owners, "calling the lands after their own names." Other buildings have cropped up too. There may be seen the imposing hotel, the public hall, and the bank. The new settlers are quite proud of their mushroom city, and congratulate one another upon its growing importance and prosperity. They draw invidious comparisons between the old village and its modern successor, for it can hardly be called a descendant. But even while they stand recounting what they are pleased to consider their wonderful achievement, their great good fortune in the capacity of nursing fathers and nursing mothers, the precious bantling of so many—well, not *prayers*, but—cares shows symptoms of weakness and disease, and the news is brought that a pestilence is in their city. It has outgrown its strength! It will sicken and die unless fresh air and pure water are specially provided for its sustenance. Amongst all the preliminary details these, which ought to have been first and foremost, have been overlooked and allowed to slide into oblivion. Even in the old days a scarcity of water had often been felt, and the wells were polluted by sewage, while the passers by had to hold their noses when they approached the "Bruk" in hot weather. *Now* things are ten times worse, and the sword of the avenger claims his prey. Can this be wondered at? In an area which formerly contained, say, but one farmhouse and a couple of labourer's cottages, there are now at least three rows of small tenements, the lower windows of which are blocked by an opposite row of wash-houses and privies, with an open drain running between. In the rear they are overtopped by the factory in which the occupiers of these miserable dens spend their working days. This is no uncommon or exaggerated description of these mushroom cities, which are scattered throughout the country, rising up, if not like that seasonable fungus in a night, at least with proportionate celerity. In nine cases out of ten the sanitary requirements are neglected, and with all our Public Health Acts and Local Sanitary Authorities there appears to be no mechanism which can promptly and effectually be brought to bear in order to prevent the evils of overcrowding in such localities. Water and drainage ought to be provided for compulsorily and

expeditiously, and a sudden influx of population, Jerry-builders included, should be restrained from going ahead too fast by the due supply of these necessities before the want of them makes itself painfully felt in the channels of disease and death.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH."

A paper read before the Dublin Clerical Association. By Rev. Marshall C. Vincent, M.A. London: *Church of England Pulpit Office*, 1889.

THE only, or at any rate, the principal fault we have to find with this paper is that it was read before the wrong sort of hearers. No doubt the Dublin Clerical Association are already fully alive to the evils of the Confessional it is just possible that they may be too fully alive thereto. It has always seemed to us that those who read papers of a controversial nature before men who already think as they do should endeavour not to blow the flame of opposition into a blaze, but to endeavour to seek for the "soul of goodness in things evil." Confession has, or at least might have, a good side; its abuse does not and cannot deny that. But of its present evil state Mr. Vincent writes clearly and forcibly, and as a warning voice we can recommend his pamphlet.

"THE EXPOSITOR." September, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

DEAN CHADWICK's paper on Judas Iscariot is interesting, but does not seem to us to throw out much new light. More striking is Professor Agar Beet's paper on "The Christian Secret." It is really an able sermon on Christian Self-sufficiency and Christian Contentment.

Professor Mayor's "Exegetical Notes on the Epistle of St. James" are not equal to those Mr. Rendall gave us on the Acts. He would translate ii. 1, "The faith of our Lord Jesus Christ who is the glory." Not only does this seem harsh and unnatural, but it ignores the fact that St. James's Epistle, being full of Hebraisms, must always be translated as though written by one who thought in Hebrew and wrote in Greek. We do not doubt that "our glorious Lord Jesus Christ" is the right translation. On iii. 6 Professor Mayor says: "Only one example in all Greek literature is adduced for [κόσμος] meaning 'totality,' viz., Proverbs xvii. 6." But in Gen. ii. 1, LXX., surely πᾶς ὁ κόσμος can have no other meaning than this. And the explanation, "in our microcosm the tongue represents or constitutes the world, because it is that member by which we are brought into communication with other men," seems wholly foreign to the context.

Dr. King's article, "St. Paul's Method of Quotation," is in answer to a statement in Mr. Bartlett's Bampton Lectures, that St. Paul quotes "the words of the Old Testament in a sense quite independent of the original connection." But Dr. King seems to forget that this is explained by a later phrase: "St. Paul made what we may call a purely literary use of the Old Testament." Therefore the substance of Dr. King's answer—that St. Paul in his quotations shows familiarity with the "inner thought" as well as the language—is no answer to Mr. Bartlett, for how can

a man make a "literary use" of a book unless he knows its "inner thought."

Professor Cheyne writes this month on the 16th Psalm; his paper is half criticism, half gush. We commend the modesty of the following passage: "Sweet is it to find something in which we can agree with the most uncritical interpreters, viz., the view that the best parts of the Psalms are true anticipations of Christ, 'that in all things,' as St. Paul says, 'He may have the pre-eminence.'" We do not know which to admire more—the "sweet" condescension to the "most uncritical interpreters," or the classification of St. Paul amongst them. Professor Bruce continues his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and Professor Emsley reviews very favourably Dr. Kennedy's "Introduction to Biblical Hebrew."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION."

SIR,—I have referred to Wilberforce, in order to inform myself of the meaning which he attaches to the saying of which he was author, "Sacraments are the extension of the Incarnation." It occurs in his work "The doctrine of Holy Baptism," and has in the first instance reference to the grace of that Sacrament reaching or extending to us the benefits of our Lord's assumption of human nature, and generally so of the grace of both Sacraments. Canon Crosthwaite is therefore speaking without book when he says, so very positively, that the words can mean no more or no less than that our Lord's Body is joined to ours in the Eucharist.

Your other correspondent says that "A. G. S." is bolder and more outspoken than I am. If he intends to attribute to me "A. G. S.'s" opinion on the Eucharist he is mistaken.

I observe that Canon Crosthwaite withdraws, or disclaims, his accusation that the Irish Low Churchmen and Broad Churchmen joined in a conspiracy to betray the essentials of the Christian religion. The apology, however, is not very gracious, for he compares them to Pontius Pilate and the woman Maybrick. Did it ever occur to the Canon that others, as wise and as learned as himself, may conscientiously entertain opinions different from his?

B.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I have only now seen Mr. Donaldson's two letters in the PULPIT of the 10th and 17th.

I must protest against his controversial style, especially where he accuses me of "wilfully misquoting Scripture" in quoting Romans xi. 32, "God hath shut up all *men* unto disobedience, that He might have mercy upon all," seeing that the word *men* is not in the text. If I had really altered the sense, it would be the merest courtesy to suppose that I had done so through carelessness. But I have not altered the sense. As Mr. Donaldson points out, St. Paul means all *Israel*. This was part of my argument—*all Israel*—"all Israel shall be saved" (v. 28); and if all Israel,

then all mankind, for in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile.

I have a further right to complain of Mr. Donaldson's (no doubt unintended) uncandour in controversy. Because I speak of the value of suggestion and the impossibility of demonstration, he says I "admit that final restoration is not in the Bible." I admitted no such thing, nor can I, with the prophecy before me that all enemies shall be abolished, and God shall be all in all. And he seems to say that I deny future punishment altogether, and think that without holiness man may see God—a charge which might with equal justice be brought against all who believe in the forgiveness of sins.

Mr. Donaldson says: "Will He lay aside His omnipotence when He performs this work? Mere omnipotence implies that there is something better than omnipotence, and what is better than the omnipotence to Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will?" This is Mohammedan theology. Christ did lay aside His omnipotence when He assumed the form of a bondservant, and became obedient unto death; but He never laid aside that which is better than omnipotence, namely, love. Holiness does not consist in power.

I have much more to say, but must have consideration for your space.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 19th August, 1889.

THE NEW EDUCATION SCHEME.

SIR,—We have got this question into the Low Church papers. We despair of admission into the High—the *Guardian*, *Church Times*, *Church Review*, or *Church Bells*. None of them will hear more than one side. Will you, then, allow me to state the case of those who object to Mr. Balfour's surrender to Mr. Sexton and the Pope?

The plan has two parts; one touches the education of the poor, the other that of the upper ranks. That of the upper ranks would lie at their own pleasure, so I pass them over. They are able to protect themselves. But still, I will return to it. But now I take the case of the poor farmer and labourer, "his country's pride." At present we have the National System, which excludes religion from school power, with emblems, catechisms, Ave Marias, crossings, etc. This, Archbishop Walsh says, is the blot on the system. He will not permit the emblems to be put into the "cupboard," as he calls it. If schools are made Denominational, the emblems, etc., are to be exposed during school hours. But this, he says, is only to be where there are no Protestant children. Then he says that he would give us the same liberty as to catechisms. This sounds very fair, and it would be so in Dublin, Cork, etc. But let us look more closely at the matter. Grants would be offered to all schools; but, with a difference, twenty pupils, say, must be produced. Look round the coast from Waterford to Donegal, and how many parishes are there where we could not produce the twenty? Neither we, nor the Presbyterians, nor the Methodists! There would be no school then but the priests'. Some expect attendance to be made compulsory. But compulsory it would be, as the Protestant farmer and labourer *must* educate his children, else all rise in life would be confined to Romanists. A child must go to the priest's school, or remain a

clod! To the priest's school, then, all our children must go. What would they learn there? Romanism and Home Rule, Fenianism and rebellion. You may say, why not keep up your own schools? What money have we for that? But what good would a boy get by attending a school with a dozen pupils? Compare *his* chance at a competitive examination with that of a boy from a class of twenty at the priest's school, with all the emulation of taking places, marks, etc. Why, every day would be a kind of competitive examination! All our children in these parts must attend the priest's school. Let this go on for a generation. A war arises with France or the States. A spark raises a rebellion. All join! Then comes a new Cromwell, seas of blood, and embittered feelings to last for a century. So far for our Poor Schools. In another letter I will ask leave to speak of the proposed Catholic University of Residence.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,

Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

"CHURCHMEN IN COUNCIL."

SIR,—It seems invidious to criticise the well meant efforts at "comprehension" put forth by "Churchmen and Council." Your pages have not given your readers any idea of the views held by them, and it would be interesting if some of your able correspondents would favour us thus.

The document I allude to is very wanting in one main point, which many valuable letters from Ireland have handled conclusively. To read the views of "Churchmen in Council" one might suppose that the "Ornaments Rubric" was the *vexata questio*. We all know it is the Romish or semi-Romish teaching on the Holy Communion which has for years been the essential end of the extreme High Church party.

Dean Perowne must know this; and he is entirely opposed to retracing our Church's position to pre-Reformation times. If there is any truth in what the Bishop of Lincoln and his following assert, that Disestablishment will come unless the views of a certain party are accepted, I believe that recognising such views by adoption of certain vestments will certainly bring this calamitous change for Old England about.

The question is one far more important than "Disestablishment," or "Disruption." If it were possible to poll the lay members of the Church, the result I fancy would show that such issues were brushed aside, and the vital questions regarded. I am only one of a vast number who believed in Disestablishment being quite possible from within. If comprehension is to be sought for in denying the anti-Romish teaching of our Prayer Book, and accepting the "vestments" for what their advocates think they are worth, viz., the doctrine they say these "vestments" symbolize, then we understand what such "comprehension" means. Dean Perowne will not deny that these "vestments" are nothing in themselves to their advocates, and yet he expects the vast number of clergy and laity who know this to agree with him in a wholesale surrender of the doctrines of our Lord and His Apostles, and our Church! I don't say he would admit this, but he cannot deny that appearances bear out such a construction of the document he has allowed his sanction.

SABRINA.

September 3rd 1889.

ST. PAUL IN ARABIA.

I SHOULD have known Thee as the Christ of God.
I should have read aright the Prophet's words—
"A face more marred than any face of man ;
A sacrifice whereof the poured out blood
Shall sprinkle many nations ;—crushed, despised,
Yet strong to bear the sins and woes of all ;—
A lamb in silent meekness led to death ;—
Therefore Thy God shall set Thee up on high,
And from the mighty Thou shalt wrest the spoil,
And tread the serpent underneath Thy feet."

But for the Christ, upon a cross, to die
The death of robbers and of slaves, — I deemed
Monstrous, unspeakable ; and many a word
Haunted my memory from prophetic Psalms
Of Christ, a priestly monarch, riding on
To victory, with his warriors like the host
Of heaven ; the dew of youth upon His brow,
Jehovah's rod of empire in His hand,
To judge and rule amidst His enemies,
Oh, how unlike to Thee ! — to Thee, betrayed,
Rejected, and abandoned by Thine own !
No dew of youth upon Thy holy brow,
But drops of blood !

Thy martyr Stephen first
Awoke misgiving in my secret soul.
I saw an angel's glory on his face ;
I heard his words ; they were not like the speech
Of one that pleadeth for his life, but words
Of some majestic teacher, when the crowd
Listens and bows in reverence ; — and he spake : —

"O stubborn children, deaf and blind of heart,
Ye, like your fathers, do for evermore
Resist the Holy Spirit ; and our God
Will at your hands require the blood of all
His saints and martyrs poured upon the earth
From Abel on to Jesus."

Then they stopped
Their ears, and rushed to stone him ; but my ears
Would not be stopped ; I listened, while I saw
The angel glory brightening on his face,
And he exclaimed :

"I see the heaven of heavens
Opened, and I behold the Son of Man
Standing beside the throne of God !"

He fell ;
I saw no more, but heard his dying prayer : —

"O Jesus, O my Saviour, Lord and God,
Receive my spirit, and forgive their sin !"

Jesus of Nazareth, his Lord and God,
A Son of Man beside the throne of heaven,
There to receive the spirit of the just,
And of the sinner to forgive the sin !
I deemed such words were blasphemy ; — I went
Onward to persecute, to bind and kill ;
But as I went, Thy martyr's dying words
Were ever in mine ear, and in mine eyes
The vision of the glory of his face,
Dying, like Abel, martyred for the truth,
Dying, like Moses, in the light of God.

The more my conscience goaded me, the more
I strove with conscience ; — and another voice
Spoke to my spirit, saying — "Persevere !
Drown thought in action !" — and it had prevailed,
Until I heard Thy voice upon the way,
Speaking, O Jesus ! from the height of heaven.
I could not hide me from thy blinding light,
O Thou who knowest all our thoughts from far !
Thou art the conqueror, Lord ! and I am thine.

And now, O Christ, the vanquisher of death,
Who hast ascended far above the heavens,
Leading captivity captive, and received
Gifts from Thy God for men, that thou mayest dwell
With pardoned rebels ! — oh, forgive the past ; —
Thou hast forgiven it ; — and accept my life,
And consecrate it, that I may declare
Salvation to the nation, and proclaim
Glad tidings to the lowly and the poor ; —
Healing to those whose hearts are broken, light
To those who languish in the shades of death ; —
And let me tell the promise of the time
When all the principalities and powers,
Thrones and dominions, of the universe
Shall be subdued to Thee, and death and hell
Shall be abolished, and Thou shalt restore
Thy power and Kingdom back to Him who gave,
That God the Father may be all in all.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

THE death is announced at Ovingdean Rectory of the Rev. Alfred Stead, aged seventy-nine. Deceased graduated at Caius, Cambridge, in 1833, and was ordained in the following year. He was appointed rector of Ovingdean in 1844.

MR. CORBET, M.P. for the Droitwich Division of Worcestershire, has decided to restore Dolderhill Church at a cost of £1,000. The parishioners have passed a resolution heartily thanking the hon. member, who is the patron of the living.

THE Queen has, on the recommendation of the Secretary for Scotland, appointed the Rev. Allan Menzies, D.D., minister of Abernyte, to be Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism at St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, in the room of the late Professor Crombie.

THE Rev. Henry Charles Raymond-Barker, rector of Daglingworth, and Hon. Canon of Bristol, died on Sunday. He graduated at Merton College, Oxford, in 1827, and was ordained in 1829. He was appointed to the rectory of Daglingworth in 1841, and an Honorary Canon of Bristol in 1873.

THE *Western Mail* says that the Bishop of Bangor contemplates retirement directly after Christmas. His lordship, who has filled the see of Bangor for thirty years, has attained to the age of seventy-seven. He was rector of Merthyr Tydvil from 1844 to 1859, and during the latter portion of that period was also Archdeacon of Llandaff.

THE following appeared in the *Morning Post* of Friday week : — "The Rev. H. R. Haweis met with a bad accident last week, dislocating his left arm by a fall from his tricycle while proceeding at a rapid rate down hill. Mr. Haweis is at present staying at the Bishop of Gloucester's palace, and has so far recovered as to be able to attend the Gloucester Festival."

It is announced that the Very Rev. Dr. John West, Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, has resigned in consequence of ill-health. He graduated at Trinity College in 1827, was ordained two years later by the Bishop of Kildare, and was chaplain to the Lord-Lieutenant 1840-86. He has been Dean of St. Patrick's since 1864, and is Vicar-General in Spirituals, and Registrar of the Order of St. Patrick.

THE Rev. H. Littlehales, writing from Worcester on Friday, the 6th inst., says : "When applying this morning at a vicarage in this diocese for the loan of

the key of the parish church a fee of sixpence was demanded, and I was told that such a sum was invariably expected and received. May I ask if I should have been justified had I refused to pay, this being but an ordinary parish church?"

THE Duke of Bedford has given a second donation of £200 towards the restoration of Peterborough Cathedral. His grace had previously subscribed £500. The underpinning of the entire nave and the repair of the west front are amongst the work yet to be taken in hand. A ladies' committee has been formed to raise a fund for the internal decoration, and the Duchess of Rutland has been asked to accept the presidency.

THE Rev. Reginald Gunnery, formerly vicar of St. Mary's, Hornsey-rise, and St. George's, Worthing, died on Monday in his sixty-fifth year. Deceased graduated at St. John's, Cambridge, in 1847, and was ordained in the following year to the curacy of St. Mary, Kingston-on-Hull; he was secretary of the Church of England Education Society from 1854 to 1861; vicar of St. Mary's, Hornsey-rise, 1861-81; and vicar of St. George's, Worthing, 1881-3.

As the Rev. R. B. F. Elrington, vicar of Lower Brixham, his wife, and daughter, were returning from a drive along the new road in an open carriage last Tuesday week, the horse suddenly shied on hearing a steam threshing machine, and, the wheels of the carriage running against the kerb, the carriage was upset. The driver was thrown from his seat, but saved himself from serious injury. The vicar and his wife, both of whom are aged, received severe shocks, and Miss Elrington had a few slight cuts on the face.

ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, Beesby, near Alford, was opened on Wednesday after a successful restoration by Messrs. Kirk, of Sleaford, Mr. Kime, of Caudlesby, being the builder employed. On the opening day there was an early celebration, and at 11.30, after matins, the Bishop of Lincoln preached an excellent sermon, and his lordship was followed in the afternoon and evening by Canon Fisher and the Rev. H. Footman. There was a large gathering of clergy and other neighbours. The offertories amounted to £19. 0s. 1d.

ON Monday the 2nd inst., the Bishop of Sodor and Man gave an address from Genesis xxviii. 17 at the dedication of four memorial windows in the parish church of Kirk Bradden, Isle of Man. Three of the windows have been placed in the chancel. The centre one—subject the Crucifixion, in memory of the late Rev. William Drury, who had been vicar for forty years; that on the north side—subject the Last Supper, in memory of Mr. Drinkwater Lawe, the late son of Sir W. L. Drinkwater, her Majesty's First Deemster; and that on the south side in memory of the late Deemster Stephen. The fourth window, which has been placed in the nave, is in memory of the late Mr. W. A. Hutchinson. Its subject is "Praise." They have all been designed and supplied by Messrs Clayton and Bell, with the advice of Mr. Pearson. On Sunday week his lordship preached at the last of the present series of services on Douglas Head. Over 2,000 residents and visitors were present.

THE Bishop of Lincoln will hold his Visitation in October at the following centres:—Grantham, 14th; Lincoln, 15th; Spalding, 16th; Boston, 17th; Louth, 18th; Brigg, 19th; and Gainsborough, 21st.

THE Bishop of Rochester intends to deliver his Charge to the clergy of the diocese, on the occasion of his third quadrennial Visitation in the choir of St. Saviour's, Southwark, on the afternoon of Tuesday, October 15. Evening prayer at 2.30, after which the Charge will be delivered.

THE *Church Review*, in the first of a series of notices on "octogenarian Worthies," gives a brief history of the Bishop of Chichester — "a conspicuous instance of an aged prelate who works like a young man, while exhibiting the wisdom of an old one."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Bromhead, Rev. J. N., Vicar of Drighouses, near York; Rector of St. Mary's, Lymm, Cheshire.
 Bryans, Rev. Edward Lonsdale, late Assistant Master at Malvern College; Rector of Quedgeley, Gloucester.
 Formby, Rev. Christopher Hope, B.A., Rector of Ridlington, Rutland.
 Gray, Rev. Samuel, Rector of Leconfield and Scarborough; Rector of Bepton, Midhurst, Sussex.
 Guest, Rev. G. W., Rector of St. Mary's, Lymm; Vicar of Drighouses, near York.
 Hinchcliffe, Rev. E., M.A., late Munsteven Exhibitioner of St. John's College, Cambridge; Head Master of St. Michael's College, Tenbury.
 Howard, Rev. John, B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Walshaw, Lancashire.
 Hutton, Rev. Charles F., M.A., Warden of Daventry School; Head Master of the Pocklington Grammar School.
 Jones, Rev. David, B.A., Curate of Llandilofawr, Carmarthenshire; Vicar of Llansadwrn-with-Llanwrda, Carmarthenshire.
 Lloyd, Rev. James Hughes, M.A., Curate of Aberdare, and Curate-in-Charge of Aberaman, Diocese of Llandaff; Vicar of Talley, Carmarthenshire.
 Shuttleworth, Rev. William Starkie, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mary Magdalene, Wandsworth Common.
 Taylor, Rev. Samuel Mumford, Curate of St. John's, Leeds; Incumbent-Designate of the Woodford Memorial Church, Leeds.
 Watt, Rev. Edwin, Rector of Bepton, Midhurst, Sussex, and late Chaplain of Christ Church, Neuilly, Paris; Rector of Leconfield and Scarborough, Yorkshire.
 Williams, Rev. David Edward, M.A., Rector of Llanfrynach, Breconshire; Vicar of Llawhaden-with-Bletherstone, Pembrokeshire.
 Williams, Rev. Llewelyn Morgan, Perpetual Curate of Beaufort; Rector of Dowlais, Glamorgan.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Chittenden, Rev. Thomas Knapp, D.D., for thirty-one years Vicar of Kirtlington, at Kirtlington Vicarage, Oxford, on the 7th inst., aged 70.
 Gore, Rev. Henry James, M.A., formerly Rector of Rusper, and lately of 7, Well Road, Hampstead, on the 3rd inst., aged 75.
 Gunnery, Rev. Reginald, formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Hornsey-rise, and St. George's, Worthing, at Worthing, on the 9th inst., aged 64.
 Hewitt, Hon. and Rev. Cornwallis C., at the Palace, Tuam, on the 4th inst., aged 42.
 Kidd, Rev. Philip Chabert, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxon, Rector, at the Rectory, Skipton-in-Craven, on the 9th inst., aged 71.
 Raymond-Barker, Rev. Henry Charles, Rector of Daglingworth and Hon. Canon of Bristol, at Daglingworth Rectory, near Cirencester, on the 8th inst.
 Seggins, Rev. William Henry, Chaplain of the Lambeth New School, West Norwood, at Falmouth, on the 30th ult., aged 74.
 Stead, Rev. Alfred, at Ovingdean Rectory, on the 5th inst., aged 79.
 Wiseman, Rev. Frederick James, at Rutland Lodge, Bitternae, on the 7th inst., aged 37.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ELIJAH.

BY THE REV. CANON RAWSTORNE.

SERMON PREACHED ON THE TWELFTH SUNDAY
AFTER TRINITY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1889.

“And he said, I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts.”—1 KINGS xix. 10.

THERE are some characters in Holy Scripture that we find ourselves able to understand and to feel with and in some degree to copy and imitate. There are others, with respect to which we only feel ourselves able to stand a long way off, and wonder, and admire. Of the latter kind is the prophet Elijah, of whom we read so much these three Sundays. There is nothing nobler in Scripture than the picture which is painted for us of this great prophet. He stands by himself in his stern and lonely grandeur; and, as we read of him, we can hardly imagine him to have been a man like ourselves, so strong was he, so fearless, so severe, so unbending, so self-contained.

He was one of those great men, whose whole life has been devoted to one great work. His parents, whose names are quite unknown to us, gave him a name which contains in itself a description of the whole aim and work of his after life. Elijah, or (written more fully) Elijahah, means “My God is Jehovah.” His birth fell in a time when there was a great controversy between the worship of Jehovah and that of Baal, and we may feel sure, that his name was given him by godly parents, as a means of fixing him on what they believed to be the right side. They wished him to be very jealous for Jehovah, God of hosts; and he was through life what they wanted him to be.

Let me quote this as an encouragement to parents. What you wish your child to be, according to God’s will, he most probably will be; and that because, trusting in the help of God, you will take the necessary means of making him so. If, for example, any parent among us has an earnest desire to save his child from the general unsettledness of mind, which results from the rash speculations of modern philosophy, or from the superstitions and insincerities, which degrade the religion of the hour, or (more important still) from moral evil, the corruption which is in the world through lust, he may, with God’s blessing, hope to succeed, as Elijah’s parents succeeded, in saving their son from that idolatry, combined with

vice, which Jezebel had made the court religion of Samaria.

Now, when a man contends all his life for one great cause, as this man did, we naturally ask—Was it a cause that was worth fighting and suffering for? We ask that question with regard to the controversy of which Elijah was the chief hero. The question lay, we find, between the worship of Jehovah and that of Baal. Was there anything more in that question than a difference of names? When, for example, a Hebrew parent named his child Hananiah (the grace of Jehovah), and one of Jezebel’s countrymen, the Phœnicians, named his child Hannibal (the grace of Baal), was there anything more at stake in that naming than a mere difference of the two syllables Jah and Baal? Let me notice two points of difference between the two religions, which will show how great a matter it was for which Elijah contended.

Baal-worship was the worship of outward material nature. To the worshipper of Baal his gods were before his eyes—the sun, the moon, the stars, and all the visible or hidden powers of nature—all these formed the Saba or host of heaven, all these were the Baalim or lords; and the sun, walking in his brightness, was the chief potentate amongst them all. To the worshipper of Jehovah, his Deity was the One Self-existent, who was above all these, and Creator of them all—the One whom no man hath seen, nor can see, to whom all the objects and powers of nature are but creatures and servants, whom He has made, and who execute His commands.

This was one difference, of which no one can fail to see the greatness. The second was as great, or even greater in its moral effects. The worshipper of Baal believed that his god had power, but not that he had holiness. The worshipper of Jehovah believed in God’s almightiness, but much more intensely in His holiness. When the prophet Isaiah saw a vision of God, and heard some of the words of heaven, the utterance of the seraphim, which was borne upon his inward prophetic ear, was not “Mighty, mighty, mighty,” but “Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah, God of hosts.” That thrice-repeated word, “Holy, holy, holy,” contains in itself the grand superiority of the religion which God had given to the Jews, over those which the heathen nations had acquired, we know not how. In Baal the heathens worshipped power alone; in Jehovah the true Israelites worshipped power and holiness combined; but they had light to see that holiness was the greater attribute of the two.

This difference in belief produced a corresponding difference in the whole character of the worship. The worshipper of Baal, looking on his god as a god of power alone, built him costly temples, offered him numberless sacrifices, performed carefully his rites and ceremonies; but, not believing him to be a god of holiness, or to require holiness in his followers, never connected his own

moral life with his religion. Baal wanted sacrifices, not holiness; Baal did not count it sacrilege when vice and wickedness was perpetrated by his worshippers in the precincts of his temples. The religion of Baal was no check on pleasure, and issued no commands against sin. Jehovah, on the other hand, was so holy that in His sight the very heavens were not clean, nor His angels faultless. And so Jehovah's worshippers learnt that the becoming ornament of a temple is holiness, and that true worship is not sacrifice nor offering, but doing justice, and loving mercy, and walking humbly before God.

It is easy to see why the worship of Baal was popular. Its ceremonial functions were magnificent, its clergy numerous, its devotional excitements entrancing; but it restrained no desire, it repressed no lust, it forbade no sin. Such a religion would have plenty of adherents among ourselves, if only people could believe in it; but it is to be hoped that the teaching of Christianity and the spread of enlightenment has made such belief impossible. Yet too much of immoral tendency is grafted from time to time upon imperfect contemporary Christianity, so that its testimony for virtue and against sin is often very much enfeebled and obscured. In those days the prophets of Jehovah were the only witnesses for the great truth of God's holiness; and it often happened that Jehovah's champion had to feel that he had to fight his battle alone.

Now we have no more among us any actual Baal-worship. The solar myths have sunk into curious objects of antiquarian research for students of the comparative history of ancient religions; and Baal himself is dead, discovered to be a sphere or spheroid of perfectly inanimate matter, moved by laws over which he himself has no control. But the same causes which made the people prefer his service to that of Jehovah are still parts of human nature. Religion and morals, or—let us use the more Christian word—religion and holiness are too often parted still, in Christian as well as in heathen lands. If we examine fairly our own beliefs and professions and practices, we shall find too many rifts inserting themselves between what we profess and what we do. There is still need for men who shall be, like Elijah, very jealous for Jehovah, the God of holiness—the God who asks from His worshippers not sacrifice and offering, but the devotion of the heart and the obedience of the life.

We may now have at least a faint idea what was the great cause that was expressed in Elijah's name and embodied in his life. "My God is Jehovah"; so said his name, so answered his life—a life not faultless, but true all through from the beginning to the end. May yours be the same, all you whose lives are still to live! Might ours, for whom life is drawing towards its end, have been the same! May those who have still a long future

to look forward to, become day by day more ardent and more patient followers of the Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts! No more worthy life can be imagined than one spent in living out a faith like that. And such lives are needed now as much as ever.

For, little as perhaps we notice it, the same controversy exists in our days as did in those of Elijah, only in an altered form. Baal, the sun-god, is dead, as we were observing a few moments ago, but Baal-worship is alive, and perhaps is advancing on a flowing tide. We saw that Baal-worship is, in its essence, the worship of material nature—making the world to be God, instead of only God's handiwork. That is a belief which is fast gaining ground, in some as a theory, in others only as a feeling. There are many who idolise the machine of nature, and cannot rise to the thought of the great God beyond and above it, who made it, and who at every moment moves and directs it, and whose Spirit moves everywhere over its infinite depths, and through all its complicated wheels. Now nature-worship always leads to immorality and vice, for nature, although grand and beautiful, is not wholly good. It does not embody that ideal holiness which alone man can worship without idolatry. This is, according to the Christian doctrine, a fallen world; and, according to the observation of every thoughtful person, a world in which much exists which ought not to be, and much is done which ought not to be done. Account for the phenomenon as we will—by a fall, as the Christian religion does,¹ or by an imperfect creation the work of an imperfect Creator, as many sects ancient and modern have done, or by imperfections existing in and inseparable from eternal matter—the fact remains that there is much in the world which the enlightened conscience of man condemns; that there is evil in the world, and that it is sometimes difficult to see whether, on the whole, the good or the evil predominates. The nature-worshipper worships the universe as it is—its evil as well as its good. He fathers the evil as well as the good upon the Deity, who never can be, to idolaters of nature, a God of perfect holiness. In this form, the great controversy between Baal and Jehovah may rise—nay, has risen again, and men may still be called to be very jealous, as Elijah was, for Jehovah, God of hosts; and the children of Jesus of Nazareth may be tempted, as the children of Israel were, not perhaps to throw down temple or altar externally—they will maintain those, no doubt, for æsthetic reasons—but to let the God of holiness vanish imperceptibly out of the inward temple of their hearts.

I have ventured to attempt to explain the general meaning of this prophet's life. Let us now take a lighter, perhaps to some a more interesting, part of the subject—his personal character.

The great charm of this is that it has two sides, one strong and stern, the other tender and even

weak, and the contrast of the two is singularly beautiful. Let us look at the stern side first. King Ahab goes down to take possession of the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite, the man whose murder he had ordered. As he enters his new possession through the opening in the high vineyard wall, there stands in the doorway alone, in his camel's hair garment, and with the leathern girdle about his loins, the man whom he fears more than any armed assassin, the man whom he hates, and whose life he has sought, but whom he dare not kill. The king exclaims, "Hast thou found me, O my enemy?" And the prophet answers, "I have found thee, because thou hast sold thyself to work wickedness before Jehovah." And then comes the awful denunciation of death and ruin on him and all his family.

Or look at him on Mount Carmel, as we read in the lesson this morning. There is the lonely man again, in the midst of a nation of idolaters, amongst the prophets of Baal and Ashtaroah, 850 men. The fire descends from heaven at his prayer. The people shout out, "Jehovah, He is the God; Jehovah, He is the God." Then comes forth the awful sternness of the character. "Take," he says, "the prophets of Baal, let not one of them escape"; and they are all brought down to the brook Kishon and slain there. It had not yet been made known to mankind anywhere—not even to the prophets, who were centuries before their age—that such a massacre must needs be hateful to the God of love.

And now let us look at the weak and tender side. Immediately after the moment of triumph there came the reaction. We see the strong man fleeing to the wilderness in dread of Jezebel. He is quite alone in the desert; the excitement of the struggle is past, and all his strength is gone. His work seems to him to have failed, his cause to be lost, and nothing left for him but to die. "I have been very jealous for Jehovah, God of hosts, because the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away." We see him throwing himself down desponding on the dry sand, beneath the retam tree, the desert acacia, whose leaves are too scanty to form a refreshing shade, and desiring that he might die. "It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers." There is the strong, bold man feeling his weakness at last, and casting himself helpless on his God. Nothing more true to nature. None is so strong that he has not his hours of weakness; none so courageous that he is not a coward sometimes; none so sanguine that he has not hopeless moments, in which he feels he must cast himself and his burden somewhere—happy, if he has not lost his hold upon Jehovah, the God Who is, and knows that he may cast it there, on the God Who lives Himself, and can give

His children a share in His own life and immortality.

In the midst of this reaction the prophet receives his encouragement and his reproof. The reproof comes first. Jehovah passes by him; and there is first a mighty strong wind, and then an earthquake, and then a fire, and after them a still small voice. And it is revealed to him that Jehovah's presence is not best exhibited in these violent powers of nature, but in his own still, small, inward voice. Elijah himself had been like the storm, the earthquake, and the fire; and now he was to learn, when it was too late, that the still small voice of gentle persuasion has more of God in it, and more of real power, than any severity or violence.

Then comes his consolation. The cause of Jehovah is not lost, the prophet of Jehovah is not alone; there still remain seven thousand in Israel whose knees have not bowed to the idol, and whose lips have never kissed him. He receives leave to depart; and he is permitted to see a successor, who will carry on his work when he himself is gone.

After this the scene changes as in a dissolving view, and we find an entirely different picture before our eyes. Sinai has disappeared with its red granite peaks and cliffs and its dry lonely valleys, and we find ourselves in the midst of a scene of peaceful rural fruitfulness. There is a vast open corn-field, Abel-meholah it is called, which means the plain of dancing—perhaps from some forgotten entertainment given long ago—perhaps because its richness and luxuriance makes the cultivator's heart to dance for joy. There are twelve pairs of oxen ploughing in the field of Shaphat (a name which means the judge, and perhaps describes his position as a man of influence, looked up to by his neighbours as an arbitrator in their little differences). He had named his son Elisha, perhaps out of the 46th verse of the 18th Psalm (one of the most ancient ones, and one of the few which the critics still permit David to retain). The name means "my God is my salvation"; but it contains no allusion to the great controversy of the age between Baal and Jehovah. The family perhaps, like many of the best religious of all times, was godly without being controversial. This son of the Judge is holding the last plough in the field; and the others, in the hands of slaves or hired labourers, are at work in front of him, so that the young master may see how the servants perform.

Suddenly, the man of God, fresh from Sinai, comes upon his journey, clothed in the prophet's garment, a cloak or mantle woven of camel's hair; and, without a word, he goes to the nearest ploughman, and throws the mantle over his shoulders, and then passes on his way. The man of God is well known to all Israel, and his action is at once understood. It means that the young man must leave his fields, and his oxen, and his father and

mother, and wear the prophet's mantle, and share his labours, wanderings and dangers. He does not refuse. The spell of the superior mind has fallen upon him: the feeling of a call from God has taken possession of his heart; and he ran after the prophet, and said, "Let me, I pray thee, go and kiss my father and mother." It is strange, yet very true to nature, that the stern Elijah gave a more indulgent answer than even the gentle Jesus gave in after times to exactly the same request. "No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God,"—so said our Lord. Elijah only said, "Go back, for what have I done to thee." The lonely man, who had now nearly struggled through his life of danger and agitation, could not terminate another's peaceful happiness without pain. He could not be severe on him, whom he was calling to resign his happy earthly ties. "What have I done to thee? why should I burden thee? why should I require thee, a moment before the need, to be a lonely wanderer like myself."

There are more illustrations to be found, both of the sterner and of the gentler side of this great character; but enough I think has been said to bring each of the two points clearly before our minds. There is only time to direct attention to the leading practical lesson of his whole career. This is the determination, in which he persevered through life, to hold fast to right, truth and goodness (all of which were personified to his mind in the one name Jehovah), though seemingly alone. His tendency was, as we have seen, to exaggerate the odds against him: but the power in his opponents hands was really overwhelming. The fashionable world, led by Queen Jezebel, was all on Baal's side; the democracy ebbed and flowed, as is its wont; it had its moments of conviction and zeal for truth; but most often it followed, as also is its wont, meat and drink, and wages, and the pleasures of the flesh; and all those were with Baal. Decorative art was at the service of the royal daughter of Tyre; and Baal, and Ashtaroath still more, had a religious ceremonial able to excite minds to the verge of madness. And I suppose that the great visible luminary that came forth every morning like a bridegroom out of his chamber, and rejoiced as a giant to run his race, must have seemed, to those who had no idea of his real nature, to invite and demand the worship which in those days he actually received from all the world. At any rate, he was worshipped with one consent by all mankind, literally from China to Peru. The only absolutely catholic religion that has ever existed on earth was the worship of the sun. Yet there were seven thousand left in Israel who had not worshipped the idol. Each of these in his quiet retirement and humble sphere had persevered against strong temptation. They had not swum with the stream, when it set so strong into the groves and temples of Baalim and Ashtaroath.

It often happens that one who desires to hold to any way of right and truth, to any strict unworldly principle, finds himself isolated. I only, he thinks, am here for what I believe to be the Lord's will and the Lord's way; but Baal's prophets are 450 men, and the prophets of Ashtaroath 400. And those who follow the fashions of the world are recognised by the world—they eat at Jezebel's table; while those who desire only to speak the truth, and do the truth, have to betake them to the wilderness. They find that the prizes of life, and the admiration of society, are for those who take the world as it is, and not for them. How much better to avoid all singularity, to follow the fashions, to echo the popular speech, and to swim with the stream! This temptation comes especially to the young, to whom the opinion of their fellows is most apt to take the place of God. And it is very hard for any of them to serve God in isolation.

Yet they need not be alone, for there are many thousands like them in Israel—disheartened often, fainting often, lonely often, but encouraged always by Jehovah's still small voices. All these form part of the one communion and fellowship. All these pray for one another, although to each other they may be unknown; all these shall in due time rest from their labours, and afterwards their works shall follow them, as will not be the case with any work which has not been truly done; and though the triumphant close, typified by the chariot and horses of fire, may be reserved for the great hero saint, like him whom we have been studying, yet not for him alone is the contented retrospect of an earthly life spent truthfully as under Jehovah's eye; and not for him alone is the final home of peace.

HOW TO DEVOTE THE HEART TO GOD.

BY THE REV. WALTER B. MONEY, M.A.,
RECTOR OF WEYBRIDGE, SURREY.

SERMON PREACHED AT ALDEBURGH-ON-SEA, ON
SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 1ST, 1889.

"My son, give Me thine heart."—PROVERBS xxiii. 26.

HAVE you really and truly given God your heart? Shall we, each of us, this morning try to imagine God putting this question to us? How uncomfortable many of us would feel if, when we were quite alone, we heard God's voice quite plainly and unmistakeably asking us this. Perhaps we feel a bit uncomfortable now? It is a little short question, but it seems to pin us down to something so very definite; and perhaps for a good many years we have been taking refuge from what is unpleasantly definite in a religion which is very indefinite. Now I suppose that if we were suddenly surprised by hearing the voice of God asking us this, we should try to give some answer

to it. We should not give in at once, and throw ourselves on God's mercy and say, "God, Father, I have never yet given Thee my heart." Well, what should we answer? Perhaps one would say, "I have always believed in the Revelation of Scripture; I have always taken a special interest in religious questions; I have liked to see earnest work going on in the Church;" and even while we were trying to give our answer, surely we should hear those troublesome words coming into our ears with strange persistency: "My son, give Me thine heart," convicting us of the unreality of our answer, and our words would grow more and more faltering; till at last we should break them off altogether, and say with sorrow, but with truth, "Lord, it won't do: I can't go on taking refuge in lies; I have never given Thee my heart."

Another, perhaps, would say that he had taken a keen interest in all the social questions of the day, had been very anxious in every way to promote the good of mankind; or another would tell how he had always tried to avoid doing what he knew to be wrong; another, that he had waged a long warfare against some special temptation or temptations of his life. But with each and all the result would be the same; they could not go on for long, while still the voice of God came ringing in their ears, "My son, give Me thine heart. Have you given it to Me? that is the question I am asking you." We should all soon see that we were trying to evade the question as we had been evading it for years.

"My son, give Me thine heart." It is the Father asking from each child the free gift of the heart's love. The gift of the heart to God means the personal love of a child for its father; it means putting God always first in the life, and keeping near God in thought all through the day; it means real trust in God, a willing obedience to God, a willingness to endure whatever it is God's will we should endure. This, and this only, is "giving God the heart"; this, and this only, is true personal religion. I am certain that we all see the rightness and the reality of this; when once we come face to face with the thought, we do see clearly how very much of unreality there is about our religion.

I daresay that once, when we were more childlike than we are now, we did see very clearly that true personal religion meant nothing short of this giving of the heart to God, and we did strive to do it; but we found that it meant the giving and the doing of more than we were prepared to give and do, more of an effort, more of a surrender, than we could manage, and so we drifted away from the profound truth of personal religion, personal love for God, communion with Him, obedience and surrender to Him, and growth in grace; and we have as it were taken refuge in the half-way house or houses, some of which I have suggested: we have been trying to make life easy both ways—a little bit for God, a good bit for the world, and perhaps

even in the little bit for God, there has been the underlying motive of liking to be thought well of in the world, and perhaps even more, liking to think well of ourselves.

My friends, must it not be a most dangerous thing to settle down, as so many of us do, into this kind of state? If that troublesome voice comes to us again, "My son, give Me thine heart," let us thank God for it, even though it gives us a good bit of pain. Don't let us try to silence it, to drive it away. It is surely God's love once more trying to bring us into the light, into personal communion with Him.

Well, now, we will suppose that God has once again in our lives troubled us with these thoughts, that we have come to have a restless dissatisfied feeling with the religion of our lives, and yet seem almost afraid to commit ourselves by giving ourselves up to this real personal religion, and perhaps hardly know how to set about it. Cannot we think out some thoughts together which shall help us.

First, then, the giving of the heart to God in this true way is all of God's grace. No man can do it by himself; that truth lies at the bottom of all true religion. Do you accept that truth? Do you thoroughly believe it? Then follow it up and see to what it leads.

"My son, give Me thine heart." Could you ever hear a cry of more tender pleading love? None of us has ever desired the heart's love of another so much as God desires the heart's love of His children. Then, of course, God will bestow the grace to enable us to give it; it is impossible that God can desire a thing very much, can lovingly, with divine yearning, ask for it, and not be most ready, most anxious to give the grace that is required.

As you shrink back from the thought of what this personal religion means, and almost fear to try to give your heart to God, cannot you, ought not you to fortify yourself with this thought, that God will give you all the help you need, just because He wants your heart? So much and the more your life seems to need His help, the more it will be given. You are standing in the boat asking Jesus if you shall go to Him across the waters, with nothing to save you from sinking but your faith in the power of Him to whom you wish to go, and once more the voice of Jesus is heard saying, "Come: I will not let you sink; I will hold you up as I held up St. Peter."

So as you desire to give your heart to God, do not look ahead, do not look at the water you have to cross, but look only to the power of God's grace and step forth. Do not say, "I don't believe I could so give my heart to God that I could bear anything for Him"; leave that to Him when the time comes: "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." St. Peter vowed in confidence he would stand by Him through all. He failed; you will be none the more likely to bear a great sorrow for God's sake because you think now you would; but

give your heart to Him as best you can in the present, and His grace will be sufficient for you when the time comes.

Secondly, we must be intensely whole-hearted and earnest in the matter. "Thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him with *all* thine heart." "Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it." There must be no more fitful efforts, no more half-hearted prayers which seem to have no real desire in them. God's grace is given always to those who earnestly seek it. You want your religion to be a religion of personal communion with God for a lifetime, a religion of growth. You know that this is beyond you without God's help. If you want that help you must seek it with your whole heart. You must go on seeking it with the same earnestness and persistency with which you would seek anything in this world which you greatly desired. You must wrestle with God until He blesses you, and that wrestling may be very earnest and real in its persistency, even though it be very quiet.

Thirdly, we must, I am sure, expect a good deal of pain and a good deal of struggling, and we must be prepared to bear it, perhaps for years, perhaps for a lifetime. I am sure that the highest characters in the school of God are not those who seem to experience only the joy of religion and little of the struggle and conflict. Your heart may be offered to God as truly when you are wearied with the conflict as when you are at rest in the joy of His felt sunshine. We must learn to bear the pain of ups and downs in our religious emotions. We must learn to go on as steadfastly when the heart is cold as when it is warm and enthusiastic. We must learn to bear the intense humiliation of cold-heartedness, even when we know that God's love is so great. Often I believe our dissatisfaction with ourselves has in it more of mortified pride than true humility and penitence. We are mortified that we are not better than we are. God wants to teach us to empty ourselves of all mortified pride, and always to take our proper place at the foot of the Cross. Let us give our hearts to God as earnestly as God enables us to, still that is the fitting, the only safe place for us; and when God has taught us that, each thought of our own unworthiness and coldness and slackness in His service makes us say, "Oh! how great is the love of God to love such as I am." Then we do not get restless in failure, but only more humble, more earnest, more patient in perseverance. Often in our endeavour to give our hearts to God, will God take us, allure us into a wilderness to plead with us; we must learn to be still when we are there.

And lastly, we must quietly and restfully take great pains in all our efforts after personal communion with God. We must take pains that our prayers are real and earnest and not formal. We must be sure that we do take to God the special wants of our own lives. And these we can only discover by a real watchfulness of those lives all

the day. "Watch and pray, watch and pray." If you would give your heart to God, indeed you must hear the echo of those words from the garden of Gethsemane. We must take pains that our communions are real. I wonder if we feel we thoroughly understand always what the blessings are which we seek when we come to the communion. "Lift up your hearts. We lift them up unto the Lord." Do we? Have we prepared ourselves enough before coming really to lift them up? Oh! how God would put an end to some of those dry, loveless communions of ours, in which there is no spirituality and no refreshment, if only we were earnestly labouring to give our hearts to God. I began by saying that we must quietly and restfully take pains in these things. We must give ourselves time to be restful whenever and wherever we distinctly seek to come into the presence of God. A restful, unhurried prayer will make a restful day, even in the press of work and duty; the quiet of God's presence will not leave the soul. Personal communion with God all through the day will become a possibility. A restful, unhurried communion, the meaning of which has been thought out before we come, will make a holy, calm Lord's Day, and will give us the sense of the rest-giving hand of God on our heads all through the week. None of this rest is possible unless we have restfully taken pains to give our hearts to God in prayer, in communion, aye, in the watchfulness of the day's life.

My friends, I have striven to suggest a few helpful thoughts to those who feel that they are being very specially called to be more real in giving their hearts to God, in attaining to the reality of personal religion. God's spirit alone can make them helpful to any of us. But I am sure that if we thus feel that all is of God's grace, if we in real sincerity of heart seek to live for God and hear God, if we will be content to strive with patient endurance, if we will take restful pains, God will ere long make us know that in such personal religion of communion with Him, in giving Him really our hearts, lies the peace which passes understanding, and when the day of great trial comes we shall find that He will give us grace to say—

If thou should'st call me to resign
What most I prize, it ne'er was mine;
I only yield Thee what was Thine:
Thy will be done.

THE rectory of Brindle, in the diocese of Manchester, is about to be vacated by the Rev. S. R. Eddy, who does not take advantage of the Incumbents' Resignation Act, and therefore resigns without claiming a pension.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

Certain **HARNESS** Cure.
ELECTROPATHIC BELT
 FOR
RHEUMATISM

Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes—"The Electropathic Belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.

On y Address, **52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W.
 (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
 Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1889.

FISHING IN TROUBLED WATERS.

WE noticed in a leading article, a few weeks ago, the readiness of all the religious sects to *exploit* the Socialistic views of the labouring class in favour of their own sectarian objects. We said that all alike were eager to make sectarian capital out of popular movements, whether for Romanism, for Anglicanism, or for Nonconformity. So it is happening now. Where the carcass is, there will the vultures be gathered together; and all the sectarians have assembled to make what they can for their respective sects out of this Strike of the Dock Labourers. Nonconformist ministers have had their fingers in the pie from the very beginning; and interference with popular movements is most natural, and least condemnable in them. They have been followed by certain curates and incumbents at the East End; and, last of all, Cardinal Manning has descended into the streets and taken a part, for which he had the honour of being glorified by Mr. Burns in Hyde Park. In the hands of his Eminence, sectarianism becomes almost sublime.

We naturally ask, Where is Archbishop Benson? A short time ago there was a saying current—whether made by him or for him we cannot tell—that, if the people wanted a tribune, they had only to look to Lambeth. Perhaps he is taking his holiday, and, if so, he may thank a kind providence for placing him out of the reach of temptation. For it is most emphatically the duty of ministers of religion to abstain from all demonstrations in favour of either side in a dispute like this. There is not a clear right or wrong on either side; but in both evil and good are blended,

and, in most cases, the disputant sees only the points in favour of his own side. The minister of religion should keep himself impartial, so that he may point out to each side his own moral faults, and the weak points in his own arguments, and the strength of those advanced by the other side. Above all he must not flatter power, nor blench before its threatenings. There is no doubt that the reason why ministers of religion are so eager now to pose as favours of democracy is that they know that power is passing into the hands of the proletariat. But they should remember that sycophancy is as base, when directed to King Mob, as when offered to any other temporary possessor of power. Let religion try to keep above these swelling water floods, rebuking face to face with equal voice the faults of all, counselling moderation everywhere, and preaching patient endurance of those sufferings which cannot be remedied. But, in order to wield a really powerful influence, religion must have absolutely no interest of her own—as we were saying a few days ago—no *by-end*, no *arrière pensée*. What weakens her is the intolerable sectarianism or churchiness, which the clergy now place at the very front of all their teaching and ministrations. If a body of men were to appear, who would work neither for the Church of Rome, nor for the Church of England, nor for Wesleyanism, nor for the Salvation Army, nor for any other form of Nonconformity, but simply and solely for God, and for mankind, we think that it would have enormous influence through its entire disinterestedness. He, whom all Christian bodies profess to admire and imitate, declined positively to interfere in a conflict of rival selfishnesses. "Man," said he, "who made me a judge or a divider over you?" If Cardinal Manning, and his clerical competitors for popular favour, had followed this example, by rebutting the brutal language of the demagogues who led the dockers, the hanging in effigy and parading the coffin of the chairman of the dock companies, and, above all, the organised system of intimidation called *picketing*, they would have missed a splendid opportunity for making capital for their respective churches, and would have made both themselves and their churches very unpopular; but they would have said and done the right and truthful and Christ-like thing.

The Bishop of Newcastle and Mrs. Wilberforce have returned to Benwell Tower.

OUR readers will join with us in regretting the death of Bishop Mackarness, whose ill-health compelled him to resign his charge last year. During his residence at Eastbourne his condition was on the whole gradually improving, when a few days ago a change came, and after a relapse on Sunday evening he passed away the next afternoon. Distinguished for firmness and sound sense in his administration of the diocese of Oxford, he left it with an exhortation to peace which is now needed more than ever.

SAVONAROLA—HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
RECTOR OF WARRENPOINT.

OUR subject carries us back for three centuries, and sets us down in Italy in the fifteenth century—before America was discovered, before men's minds had been opened by the Reformation—amid scenes and characters familiar to those of you who have read George Elliott's fascinating work "*Romola*." We have to deal with the fifteenth century, and with men "inheriting its strange web of belief and unbelief. Of epicurean levity and feticistic dread; of pedantic impossible ethics uttered by rote, and crude passions acted out with childish impulsiveness; of inclination towards a self-indulgent Paganism and inevitable subjection to that human conscience which, in the unrest of a new growth, was filling the air with strange prophecies and presentiments." (George Elliott).

Our subject is connected with the history of the Papacy, the most wonderful page in the world's story. How that power originated, and how, step by step, it grew to its present colossal proportions, we are not now to inquire. But the Papacy has not reached its present position without many struggles and much opposition. In the twelfth century the Albigenses rose in revolt against Rome, and Rome stifled the revolt by a crusade so bloody and barbarous, that it has never been surpassed and rarely equalled in the annals of religious persecution. Under Philip IV. of France the secular power resisted the encroachments of the Papacy, and the same period witnessed the strange spectacle of two rival popes—one at Rome one at Avignon—claiming to be the vicars of God and cursing each other in the plenitude of their apostolic authority. Those were the days of the Lollards, of Wickliffe, and of the celebrated Catherine of Sienna.

Passing on from these times, and just before the dawn of the great Reformation, we reach the age of Savonarola, the monk of Florence, who may be said to hold in Italy a somewhat similar position to that of Luther in Germany. The empire was now at its lowest point, and the Papacy at least in the pontificate of Nicholas V. may be said to have reached its highest. But then came a rapid decline. Aeneas Sylvius was in many respects inferior to Nicholas V., but after him came men whose profligate and dissolute lives made glad the hearts of the enemies of religion, until under Alexander VI. Rome became a by-word for simony, corruption, and lewdness among the nations of the earth. Murder became a trade; poisoning an art; religion an empty name; monks fell into gross sin; the clergy were dissolute and rapacious; the monasteries full of crime and impurity; the whole Church from the head to the lowest members was one mass of festering and hideous vice. We cannot understand the character of Savonarola unless we keep in mind the age in which his lot was cast; and we may be helped to form some estimate of its utter godlessness and depravity, if we consider that Savonarola lived in Italy at the time England was convulsed by the struggle known as the "*Wars of the Roses*." The glory even of the mendicants had departed, their early zeal had been succeeded by apathy, luxury, and sloth, and the preachers by pandering to the depraved taste of their hearers for

graceful rhetoric and polished diction, rather than the simple truths of religion, fostered the general corruption.

In judging of the life-work of Savonarola, we must bear in mind that his protest was against immorality and vice more than against false doctrine. In the tenth century Rome was really governed by harlots whose paramours were intruded into the very see of St. Peter, and may yet be found in the lists of the Roman pontiffs. In the fifteenth century matters were not improved despite the measures of the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Bâle. In the darkest period of Roman infamy we meet no names of blacker guilt than those of Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII., and Alexander VI., the Nero of the Papacy, whose name stands out among the criminals of humanity pre-eminent in guilt—a monster stained by every crime that degrades our fallen nature.

The following anecdotes illustrate the state of society in those days:—A man who had murdered his own two daughters was set free on the morning appointed for his execution on the payment of 800 ducats. When the Papal Vice-Chancellor was asked why such men were allowed to escape, he gave with bitter irony the answer: "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he shall pay and live, and so we think in Bologna." Three years after Savonarola entered a monastery in Bologna in 1478. An event took place in Florence which illustrates the state of the Church at that time. The Pazzi and the Medici were the two most powerful of the Florentine families, and between them existed for generations bitter rivalry. In the above year a plot was formed to murder Lorenzo de Medici and his brother Giuliano, and the occasion chosen was the celebration of High Mass during a solemn festival in the cathedral of Florence. Two priests were the chosen assassins, and the plot was favoured by no less a man than the Archbishop of Pisa. Indeed some have assigned the chief post in it to the Pope Sixtus IV. Giuliano was slain, Lorenzo escaped; the mob rose and hanged the bishop in his robes from a window in his palace and one of the Pazzi beside him. The Pope excommunicated the people, not the assassins. Such was the state of the Church in the days we speak of.

Turn we now to the man. Savonarola was born at Ferrara of a noble family, September 21, 1452. Serious even to sadness, thoughtful, poetic, visionary and enthusiastic, Savonarola early gave promise of great powers of mind, but even in childhood his prevailing characteristic was a profound love of truth. His grandfather was an eminent physician, and Savonarola was carefully and liberally educated. In Italy everything subserved the religious sentiment. Art was the handmaid of the Church. Monks were everything, and the money wrung from other lands was spent in the embellishment of Italy. The Italians desired a reform of morals and discipline. Even those who disbelieved in religion were too politic to wish for the total overthrow of a system which made Italy the centre and treasury of Christendom. When we come to speak of Savonarola as a Reformer we must bear this in mind: While the German monk denounced the false doctrine of Rome, the Florentine friar thundered against the immorality, profligacy, and simony which prevailed in the Church from the Roman Curia down to the provincial monastery. Luther denounced the Pope as Antichrist. Savonarola maintained that a false pope was a servant of Satan,

but a true pope the vicar of God. That a youth like Savonarola should be drawn to the service of the Church is natural, and he entered on a religious life with all the zeal and ardour which distinguished his character. On the 24th April, 1475, he fled to Bologna and entered the Dominican convent there. Here he spent several years teaching metaphysics and philosophy. Luther entered a convent as a student and felt aggrieved because his superiors employed him in menial offices. Savonarola desired to remain a servant, but was compelled by his superiors to assume the office of a teacher. He long hesitated to take orders because his soul revolted more and more every day from the gross immorality and lewdness of the clergy. "Would you have your son a wicked man?" he used to say. "Make him a priest."

At length he took the final step, and in 1483 we find him preaching at Florence, but his first attempts were miserable failures. He had weak lungs, a piping voice, an ungainly figure, a constrained manner; and the man whose thrilling eloquence swayed in after years the mighty masses of Florence like one man tells us of his early preaching: "I had neither voice, lungs, nor style; my preaching disgusted everyone, I could not have moved so much as a chicken." But, like Augustine, Savonarola believed in direct illumination by the spirit, while he also believed that every man "knows only as much as he works." While therefore he sought earnestly for grace and illumination from God he set himself assiduously to study the Word of God, and to prepare himself by study and meditation for the great work of preaching the truth. Very soon men began to learn that there was a prophet among them, and after a few years we find Savonarola entered on his life-work as Prior of St. Mark's, in the city of Florence.

The power wielded by Savonarola as a preacher was amazing, and must be traced to the moral beauty of his life as well as to his impassioned utterance, poetic temperament, and brilliant elocution. He laid down in the beginning of his career as a preacher three main principles, and he never wavered in his views on these points.

1. The Church of God must be renovated in our time.

2. Italy will first be scourged.

3. These things will be soon.

That such a man should see visions and dream dreams, that he should enjoy a clearer view of the mind of God than other men enjoy, that he should feel difficulty in explaining even to himself where human wisdom ended and Divine illumination began, was only natural and to be expected. One thing is clear, whatever may have been Savonarola's views on the subject of his own prophetic powers, he never throughout his entire life wavered in his belief that he had a mission entrusted to him by God to fulfil, and that God would be with him until that mission was accomplished.

Of his theological views we need say little. He demanded a reformation of manners not of doctrine, but it is certain the great Florentine preacher never dreamt of believing in the personal infallibility of the Pope. "It is not," he says, "contempt of the power of the keys to disobey the commands of the Pope when he uses his power scandalously for destruction and not for edification." "How many decrees has one pope given which another has rescinded? And how many opinions of former popes have been contradicted by later? If, in fact, the Pope errs he is not

Pope, but a man who can be deceived and err. Thus as a Christian I cannot sin, but if I sin it is not as a Christian, but as a man. In fact, the Pope can err, and indeed in two ways, either out of false conviction or out of wickedness."

"The priests go for money to the choir, the vespers, and their office. They sell the benefices, they sell the sacraments, they traffic with the mass; in short, everything is done for money." He says of the reading of Holy Scripture: "It is necessary for him who would profit by spiritual reading and penetrate the Sacred Scriptures above all things to cleanse the heart well not only from every mortal sin, but also from all self-love, and to read not only that he may teach, but in the first place to learn for himself how to live well." This intense love of purity is a strongly marked characteristic of Savonarola, and this purity, combined with a love of power in order to accomplish great purposes, often blinded him as to the true nature of the means he employed by reflecting a kind of false glory from the end back on the means. And now while the majority looked on unmoved at the mad riot of lust and crime while the heavens were fair, and no shocks of impending earthquake alarmed the crowd, Savonarola announced that the scourge was at hand. He believed in a Divine Ruler. He believed that as of old when sin abounded judgment descended so it must be now. He believed in justice and purity, and his strong will easily led him to confuse faith in a personal ruler with faith in a speedy interposition.

Florence was then ruled by the family of the Medici. Lorenzo de Medici was the patron of art, poetry, and philosophy; but while he encouraged learning, he possessed little religion, and did nothing to stem the tide of sensuality and irreligion which prevailed among the masses of the people. From the first the Prior of St. Mark's declined the friendship of the ruler of the State. When his monks besought him to pay his court to the great man of Florence: "Do I owe my election to God or to Lorenzo?" asked the friar; "if to God, then to God let us return the thanks." Savonarola saw that the real aim of the Medici was not to promote the glory of God, but to consolidate their own power, and we find him from the start coming forward in defence of the liberties of the people. Lorenzo sent gifts to the convent. The Prior accepted them for the community, but went on as before. "The good dog," he said from the pulpit, "always barks in order to defend the master's house, and if a thief comes and throws him a bone or anything else to put him off his guard, the good dog takes it, but at the same time he barks and bites the thief." Lorenzo privately placed a large sum of gold in the box of the convent. The Prior selected the smaller pieces for the poor, and sent back the rest. Such a man was incorruptible. Burlamacchi says that Lorenzo soon came to see "that this was not the soil to plant vines in." It is said that when Lorenzo lay dying he sent for Savonarola, but not even then did the Prior abate one jot of his uncompromising firmness. He would not give him absolution unless he promised to restore to the Florentines the liberties of which his family had unjustly deprived them.

We find the same spirit manifested by Savonarola in his dealings with Charles VIII. of France. He had entered Florence as a deliverer, but soon yielded to the temptation of seizing and retaining the town. The Prior sought an interview with the monarch, and fearlessly warned him not to set covetous eyes on

rights which did not belong to him, and which never could lawfully become his.

We cannot dwell particularly on the political life of Savonarola, but our sketch would be imperfect if we altogether ignored the part taken by him in politics. Through all the dangers which beset the city in its dealings with the King of France, the Prior of St. Mark's was the mainstay of the State, and when those dangers cleared away and it became necessary to provide some form of government to take the place of the tyranny of the Medici, all men instinctively turned for aid to Savonarola. The government of Florence after the expulsion of the Medici may mainly be traced to the Dominican friar, whose influence was then at its height, and men who were little inclined to look favourably on Savonarola were compelled to admit that the government he framed was the best the city ever enjoyed. Rare indeed must have been the qualities of a man who could thus powerfully influence the minds of the men of his own age, who could sway alike Pico della Mirandola, the most splendid scholar of the time, and Fra Domenico, the gentle, loving, unselfish, but withal lion-hearted monk, who clung throughout life with passionate devotion to his illustrious Prior, and whose allegiance remained unshaken through all the horrors which marked the close of his career.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

SIR,—Your readers will not be quite prepared to hear that it is possible to doubt the correctness of the formula which we repeat at our regular service, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." Yet there is an aspect from which we may regard it when the truth of it will not be quite absolute. To be quite clear, and to make no mistake as to what I mean, I may put the matter thus: "God cannot forgive sins."

This will shock the feelings of some of your readers, and yet we may say that, in a certain sense, it is true. God cannot absolutely forgive sins. His perfect justice forbids it. God's attributes are all infinite; His justice as well as His mercy. His mercy cries, Spare the sinner; but His justice just as rigorously demands punishment for the sin. Now I venture to say that this is a fact which is too often lost sight of.

This truth, once admitted, justifies the doctrine of the Atonement, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." The bloods of bulls and of goats cannot take away sin. Therefore help must come from "One mighty to save." The Lord Jesus must die. "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all." The doctrine is a large one, and one which, cannot be adequately dealt with in a newspaper.

Now "J. B.," in his letter of August 17th, which, owing to absence I have only just seen, says: "I consider that one of the great objects which the Scheme of Redemption accomplishes is the correction of defective and perverted faculties." This is true. But this, I take it, was not his original position—the position which I showed to be wrong. If I mistake not, his contention was "that the correction . . . was

absolute, irrespective either of God's attributes or of man's will." Such a position is utterly untenable.

We need two things for heaven: (1) A title; (2) A fitness. Our acceptance in Christ is our title; our new birth and holiness is our fitness. Without these things we cannot enter heaven; we have neither title nor fitness. We should find ourselves otherwise in circumstances wholly out of harmony with our being.

Then "J. B." quotes the beautiful passages: "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure"; "faith is the gift of God"; "faith which worketh by love." But he must kindly excuse me if I remark that there is no warrant anywhere that God is working in all men, and that He has given them faith. There is no warrant either that He will do so. The first condition of receiving blessings from God is the submission of the will. And man *will not*. "Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life."

Will "J. B." kindly indicate the texts which are opposite in their nature to such, as "The wicked shall be turned into hell. . . ." I have yet to learn that the Bible contradicts itself.

I think "J. B." did say that we do not want dogma. If he did not say it in so many words, he implied it. How otherwise will he justify his reference to the opinions of those men who regard the holding of dogma as destructive of character?

"It does not follow," says "J. B.," "that the Scheme of Redemption will not accomplish ultimate recovery." But does it follow that it will? "Be sure your sin will find you out." This is exemplified in the death-bed. Men live in sin. Sin sears the conscience. It dies under it. Sinners die as die the lower animals. They have no hope and no fear. The Christian knows he is going home. Will "J. B." explain this on his theories?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, September 15th, 1889.

DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION FOR IRELAND.—No. II.

SIR,—I have already explained the evil of Mr. Balfour's plan as to our poor Protestants in the remote parts. As we could not muster twenty-four pupils in many parishes, there would be no school but the priest's. Then, in addition to the three R's, our children would learn Archbishop Walsh's *fourth*, Romanism, and Mr. Davitt's *fifth*, Rebellion. All youth being so trained, when a rising occurs, to aid French or American invasion, they will join. Then you will have to send over another Cromwell to drench our fields with blood, and to leave on our minds feelings of revenge which a century will not remove. But I pass to the other part of the plan, an endowed Popish University of Residence. Who wants this? as Mr. Davitt asks. The grievances as to Trinity College and the Queen's and Royal are, as he says again, "infinitesimal." And so they are. Romanists, their faith respected, may have every honour and emolument in Trinity College, Dublin, from the Provost down to the porters. If Romanists *want* an University education they can have it. If they answer best they can gain every sizarship, scholarship, and fellowship, and become in time "monarchs of all they survey." But *they do not want it*, either in Trinity or a new University. Not one in a hundred, or more,

wants a residence in any University. Those who attend Trinity fairly represent all who would avail themselves of a residence in any college. Our Romish population may be divided into three classes. First, the nobility and landed gentry. They will all go to Oxford or Cambridge, to Trinity College, Dublin, or to London, as they can afford. Popish colleges were tried with you, and they are shut up. The *Month*, a Romish periodical, says it is better for them to be educated with us, at Oxford and Cambridge, than at Popish colleges there. Second class is those preparing to be solicitors, doctors, surgeons, merchants. They would not think of living three or four years in an University. Solicitors are bound to masters. The medical men attend St. Cecilia's Romish School of Medicine. The mercantile men, of course, begin work at once. Third class are the youth from the National Schools. What do they want with the University? What they want is food and clothing, and to be off their parents' hands. These boons they get through the intermediate and the competitive examinations. Thus they get into the Police, the Post-Office, and all branches of the Civil Service. They and their parents would laugh at the idea of losing three or four years in Archbishop Walsh's University. What would it lead to? What would it be a step to? Nothing! But I will tell you what Archbishop Walsh wants it for. A preparatory school for his Maynooth rough youth, where they may learn a little Latin and Greek, manners, and what may well be called "humanities." As it is, at Maynooth they learn nothing but the use of the Breviary, Deus, etc., with a smattering of Thomas Aquinas, etc., from their text-books. No wonder Archbishop Walsh is ashamed of the appearance they make—mere bog-trotters—on platforms and at eviction meetings. He wants to polish them up to take some of the savage rudeness off them. If England chooses to spend her millions on this furbishing up, no one can hinder her. But let her expect no return. They neither can nor will stem the tide of Home Rule and Rebellion. What the Pope could not do is beyond the power of the bishops and the priests. They may swim with the tide, but they cannot stem it. Can Parnell and Co.? I doubt it. American rebels hold the reins and the purse, and no one can take them out of their hands. Mr. Balfour's plan is deadly as to our poor Protestants. As to the Romanists, it is a million thrown away, except that Archbishop Walsh will know what to do with it, and that will be to make the priests still more mischievous to England than they are now. England educates out of her own pocket priests for the whole world. Archbishop Walsh wants a million more to make them as finished mischief-makers as they were when the Jesuits were banished from every Roman Catholic kingdom of Europe.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has returned from Bel Alp, and is now in residence at Gloucester.

THE Rev. Edward Fox, of Silverdale, Hassocks, Sussex, has transferred the patronage of the vicarage of Allington, near Bridport, to the see of Salisbury.

THE Bishop of Wakefield (Dr. Walsham How) returned on Saturday last to his diocese, after a short visit to Prado, near Oswestry, the seat of his son-in-law.

THE Bishop of Liverpool, who is staying in the Lake District, has requested the Vicar of Keswick and the Wesleyan minister in the town to inform their congregations that he holds a service in his house on Sunday afternoons.

THE *North Wales Chronicle* is authorised by the Bishop of Bangor to give an emphatic denial to the report that he contemplates resigning his see. His lordship, it is stated, is in excellent health, and daily discharges the duties appertaining to his office.

WE are requested to state that the announcement of the exchange of livings between the Rev. Samuel Gray, rector of Leconfield-with-Scorborough, and the Rev. E. Watts, rector of Bepton, Sussex, contained in our list of appointments last week, is premature.

THE Bishop of Tasmania sailed on Wednesday for Hobart in the steamship *Tainui*. His commissaries are the Rev. J. H. Browne, Rochester Diocesan Society's offices, 26, Great George Street, Westminster, and the Rev. F. D. Cremer, the Rectory, Keighley, Yorkshire.

IT is stated that a Chester sculptor has ornamented the gargoyles of the southern transept of the cathedral with fanciful carvings, similar to those in the "miserere" stalls, of the heads of Lord Beaconsfield, Dr. Kenealy, Mr. Gladstone, and Cardinal Manning. The likeness of the first three is said to be unmishtakable.

WITH reference to the announcement of the appointment of the Rev. C. H. Formby to the rectory of Ridlington, Rutland, in our last week's issue, we are requested to state that Canon Bourne and Colonel E. A. Noel are the trustees appointed by the Earl of Gainsborough, and duly present to the Noel livings as they become vacant.

THE *Farrington Advertiser* states that the Rev. G. W. Murray, vicar of Shrivenham, and Rural Dean of the Vale of White Horse, is about to resign the living which he has held for thirty years, through ill health. "During his long residence at Shrivenham Mr. Murray has made many friends, and his departure from the neighbourhood will be much regretted."

A CORRESPONDENT asks for enlightenment as to the authority for omitting the surnames of bridegroom and bride in conducting the marriage service, though when the banns are published the surnames are mentioned, the form of publication of banns given in the rubric being precisely the same as in the marriage service. A clergyman who was applied to could only say that it was customary and had something to do with the baptismal service.

THE Rev. B. Maturin, Vicar of Lymington, celebrated his jubilee as a clergyman on Sunday week, when he preached from the same text that he took for his first sermon fifty years ago. The *Salisbury Journal* says:—"For thirty-seven years the vicar has directed the parish affairs of Lymington, and the kindness and tact with which he has performed his duties have borne excellent fruit. He not only possesses the affection and esteem of his own congregation, but he is respected by all classes of the community. During the week he has been the recipient of congratulations from every side."

At the afternoon service in Exeter Cathedral, on Thursday week, the recently appointed Canon and

Prebendaries were formally stalled. Archdeacon Barnes was duly installed a Canon of the cathedral in the place of the late Canon Cook. The Rev. E. I. Gregory, vicar of Halberton, Tiverton, was installed a Prebendary of the cathedral in the place of Archdeacon Barnes, and the Rev. P. R. Scott, vicar of St. George's, East Stonehouse, was installed as Prebendary, in the place of the late Rev. C. C. Bartholomew.

THE Bishop of North China and party sail for China in the P. and O. steamship *Shannon* from Southampton on Friday next. The missionary party consists of Mrs. Scott, the Rev. Frank Norris (son of the Archdeacon of Bristol), Mr. Geoffrey Iliff, of St. Augustine's, Canterbury; Dr. Alice Marston, a thoroughly qualified lady, who has before worked in India; and Miss Florence Jackson, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Ladies' Association. There will be a farewell service in St. Peter's, Eaton Square, on Friday at 9 a.m., when Bishop Scott will celebrate Holy Communion, and a short address will be given by Canon Elwyn, Master of the Charterhouse. In a farewell letter issued by Bishop Scott to the North China Mission Associations he says it is a pleasure to be able to leave them all with the prospects of the Mission brighter than they were on his arrival. The question of a chaplain for the English Churchpeople in Tientsin and the neighbourhood still remained in abeyance, but was not lost sight of. Referring to the appointment of the Rev. C. J. Corfe as the first Bishop of the English Church to Corea, he says it is not Mr. Corfe's own wish that he is again going to the Mission-field in the far East, but in simple obedience to the call which he felt had come to him from God through the Archbishop. In January he hoped that two other missionaries would follow them out to Peking—Mr. Thompson, a student at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, who will, after learning the language, begin a small training college for native clergy; and Mr. Harris, from St. Paul's Mission-house, Burgh, who will join the Mission headed by Mr. Sprent in the interior of the Shantung Province.

At St. John's Church, Burgess Hill, on the 10th inst., the organ presented by Dr. Withers Moore and family, of the Oaks, in memory of the late Mrs. Moore, was opened for the first time, and additional interest was imparted to the services of the day on account of the enlargement of the church. St. John's was only built in 1863, being consecrated in June of that year by the late Bishop Gilbert. During the summer months the Sunday services are attended by many visitors, and as during the winter the church has been well filled, the accommodation of the present season was found to be insufficient. A north aisle has, therefore, been added, at a cost of about £700. Mr. E. J. Hamilton, of Brighton, was the architect. A clergy and choir vestry has been erected also, at a cost of about £400. This became necessary by reason of the organ-chamber, which has hitherto been used for this purpose, being completely taken up by the new organ. The whole of the expense of the north aisle and the warming apparatus is covered by the legacy of the late Colonel Elwood, of Hayton Priory, while the cost of the vestry, with the exception of about £100, has also been secured.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Andrew James Campbell, M.A., of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and Principal of the Chester Diocesan

Training College; Licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Andrew, Rev. Edward, Vicar of Mundon, Malden, Essex.
Binney, Rev. John Erskine, M.A., Vicar of Morebath, Devonshire.

De Cerjat, Rev. R., Curate of All Saints'; Paddington, Vicar of Crowan, Cornwall.

Garnett, Rev. Richard Craven, M.A., Incumbent of Settle; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.

Hill, Rev. Reginald Hay, Rector of Parham, Pulborough, Sussex; Vicar of Wethersfield, Essex.

Housecroft, Rev. Thomas, Head Master of Kineton School; Vicar of Wickham Market, Suffolk.

Hunt, Rev. J. L., Assistant Curate at Kilkhampton; Vicar of Poughill, near Stratton, Cornwall.

Jacob, Rev. D., Curate of Northallerton; Chaplain of Her Majesty's Prison, Northallerton.

Jacques, Rev. Kinton, Vicar of Westhoughton; Vicar of Brindle, near Chorley.

Jones, Rev. T. Melville, Curate of Llanwonno; Vicar of Pyle and Heneg, Glamorganshire.

Joy, Rev. Frederic Walker, M.A., Rector of Benthams; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.

Kershaw, Rev. J. C., Vicar of Walton-le-Dale; Vicar of Hartburn, near Morpeth.

Mackinnon, Rev. Donald H. O. D., M.A., F.R.G.S., Rector of Speldhurst, Kent.

Nash, Rev. S. W. M., Vicar of East Holme; and Curate of Steeple-with-Grange, Dorset; Rector of Winfrith Newburgh, Dorchester.

Pierson, Rev. W. B., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of the Good Shepherd Mission, Leeds; Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Crewe.

Rice, Rev. Charles H., B.D., Rector of Cheam; Rural Dean of Beddington.

Richmond, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Rockhampton, Gloucestershire.

Smith, Rev. S. H., Curate of St. Alban's, Birmingham; Vicar of Christ Church, Wolverhampton.

Wasdale-Watson, Rev. T. W., late Curate-in-Charge of Upwey, Dorchester; Priest-in-Charge of Pitton, Salisbury.

Watts, Rev. Edwin, Rector of Bepton, Midhurst, Sussex; and late Chaplain of Christ Church, Neuilly, Paris; Rector of Leconfield and Scarborough, Yorkshire.

Williams, Rev. James George, Vicar of St. Germain's, Peel, Isle of Man; Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Ranmoor, Sheffield.

Wilson, Rev. A. R., Curate of Jarrow Grange; Curate-in-Charge of St. Wilfrid's Rossall Mission, All Saints', Newton Heath.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bayliff, Rev. Thomas Timothy Lane, M.A., forty-three years Vicar of the parish, at Albury Vicarage, Herts, on the 11th inst., aged 82.

Crompton, Rev. John Lake, M.A., Canon of Maritzburg, at Brightmet, Pinetown Estate, Natal, on 3rd ult., aged 73.

Duthy, Rev. William, at Sudborough Rectory, Thrapstone, on the 11th inst., aged 93.

Garrett, Rev. Henry Webb, M.A., Priest, at the Vicarage, Kingsbury, Tamworth, on the 7th inst., in the 64th year of his age.

Gayfer, Rev. Arthur George, at Uxbridge, on the 9th inst., aged 40.

Lawson, Rev. Charles Thomas, late Rector of Kirton, at Brightstone, Isle of Wight, on the 8th inst., aged 55.

Mackarness, Right Rev. John Fielder Mackarness, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford, at Angus House, Eastbourne, on the 16th inst., aged 69.

Raymond, Rev. Oliver, LL.B., for sixty-seven years Rector of the parish, and Vicar of Bulmer-cum-Belchamp, at Middleton Rectory, Essex, on the 15th inst., in his 96th year.

Stuart, Hon. and Rev. Andrew Godfrey, of Bretland's, Tunbridge Wells, and late Rector of Cottesmore, Rutland, at Matlock Bridge, Derbyshire, on the 16th inst., aged 76.

Watton, Rev. Alfred, Incumbent of Handford, on the 11th inst.,

Wigan, Rev. Alfred, M.A., for thirty-three years Rector of Luddesdown, at Luddesdown Rectory, Kent, on the 28th ult., in his 71st year.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY BASSETT, M.A.,
VICAR OF DULVERTON.

SERMON PREACHED ON THE 5TH SUNDAY AFTER
TRINITY, IN ST. MARY'S, TAUNTON.

"For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."—ACTS xxii. 15.

THE second lesson of this morning gives us an account of the call and conversion of the great Apostle St. Paul, who was a vessel chosen of God to bear witness of all that he saw and heard. And what was it that he saw and heard? It was granted unto him to see Christ risen, and also ascended and clothed in glory. We gather from the narrative of the election of St. Matthias among the twelve that it was an indispensable requisite in an Apostle that he should be a witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and so before the future Apostle of the Gentiles could be admitted to that office he must have ocular evidence that Christ was risen from the dead. And this fact—this doctrine—we find ever afterwards to be the sum and substance of his teaching to all sorts and conditions of men. Does he stand before a Jewish mob who tear their clothes in their malice and vexation, and shriek out that "it is not fit that such a fellow should live," or before the High Priest and the senate of the Sanhedrin? Does he face a crowd of heathen idolaters who in their ignorance and excitement would have done sacrifice to him and his fellow-Apostle? or does he argue before the contending schools of philosophy at Athens, or plead his cause before the judgment-seat of a Felix or Agrippa? The burden of his testimony is one and the same "Jesus and the Resurrection." Or do we turn to his writings, the letters sent to the various churches, he never forgets to remind them of the first principles of the faith? "I delivered unto you that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he rose from the dead according to the Scriptures." "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." "He died because of our sins, and rose again because of our justification." Such was his witness. This mystery was predicted by the prophets, pictured in the types, declared by the Lord Himself, testified by Apostles, believed in by the Church of God, and confessed in every creed

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 718.

of Christendom. "He rose again the third day from the dead;" "I believe in the resurrection of the dead." We, brethren, live in an age when the foundations of the faith are being tested not only by fair and honest inquiry, but also with a relentless prejudice. The strife is waged not against the fruits of the Gospel, but the root that produces them; not against the palatial superstructure of charity and good works, of fellow-feeling and philanthropy, but against the foundation-stone on which the Holy Temple rests, the miraculous, the supernatural, the divine. As providence has placed this subject before us to-day, let us examine the evidences on which this article of our creed rests and claims our reception.

I. The testimony of St. Paul was that he had seen the Risen Christ, that he knew and asseverated that Christ was risen from the dead. The resurrection of our Lord is ever regarded as the greatest of miracles, and our own resurrection which depends upon it makes the heaviest demand upon our faith. Why should this be? There is no great or little with God, with whom all things are possible. Neither is there, if we reason upon the matter, with man, for it is equally difficult, because equally impossible, to restore to its place in life and usefulness an amputated limb as to revive the whole of a dead body. But resurrection from the dead is not only contrary to experience, but it touches most nearly all our hopes and fears, it involves the mystery of the future and the vast enigma of eternity. Hence comes the attraction of this doctrine to the believer, and of aversion to it in the unbeliever.

There is no doubt that at the present time a dense cloud of infidelity is drifting over the whole of western Christendom, and especially that portion where civilization has reached its highest point. There has always been unbelief more or less prevalent, but it varies like all other movements in character and mode of assault. Something like a hundred years or more ago an infidel movement sprung up in our land marked by the coarse Philistinism of Tom Paine and his followers. This largely influenced the lower orders of society. Much about the same time it burst out in France, decked in the tinsel trappings of the fashion and frivolity of the most corrupt of courts. The unholy bird then migrated to Germany where infidelity assumed the cap and gown of the scholar and critic, and sought shelter under the robes of the professor and the preacher. From Germany it has crossed over to our shores, whence it took its rise, and is now being greedily adopted by critics who lean on others for their opinions, and study the Word and its contents with a foregone conclusion that miracles and prophecy, and the whole system of the supernatural is simply and entirely impossible. At first this school on the Continent and in our island attacked the lesser miracles, humanised them, qualified, evacuated, allegorised, and then denied

them, till emboldened by their own profanity they attack the fortress of the resurrection itself. Hence books and pamphlets, novels, tales, tracts and treatises, magazine articles, and newspaper leaders are in circulation far and wide bidding us surrender the old faith as untenable, and give the ancient records a new turn and a nineteenth century interpretation. Strange teaching this! Forsooth that the Church has been in error throughout her age-long career, that all our faith and morals have been derived from fable, and all that is good and excellent and lovable is based upon a pious fraud—a patent falsehood!

But the question is put to us, and we have to answer it. What proof have we of the resurrection of the Lord?

In answering this demand we must remember that every question admits only of the proof that is at once proper to it and possible. A mathematical problem requires a mathematical proof, a philosophical theory, a logical proof, and such a question as the credibility of the resurrection must rest like any other historical fact upon the basis of testimony. As for all past occurrences this is the only mode of arriving at a valid conclusion, so in all the ordinary matters of the world we accept testimony as satisfactory evidence when its source is reliable, and the facts attested fall within the compass of the possible. We might ask of any of you, who was king of this country—say 500 years ago—and the answer would be ready, Richard II., and no doubt or hesitation would obstruct your reply; but how do you know this? Simply by the records of history. Or suppose I were to ask of any one here present, how old are you? You would name in an instant the year and the month and the day of your birth. But how have you attained that knowledge? You depend entirely on the parish register and the verbal evidence of others who are older than yourself, and are qualified to bear witness on the point. And are not these two authorities the written register and the spoken word, in their nature parallel to the Scriptures and the testimony of those that saw the Lord after He was risen?

An important feature in the validity of the witness borne to this central miracle of our faith is, I fear, oftentimes unobserved. It is a statement of Scripture that our Lord did not appear to all men, but to witnesses chosen before God. But who were these witnesses? They are types of all classes of spiritual condition. The believer, the misbeliever, and the unbeliever were all eye-witnesses of the fact, all were alike persuaded of the truth of it, and all bore record to what they had seen and heard. Thus our Lord appeared to Mary Magdane and to members of the Apostolic twelve. These, though they did not expect the resurrection of the Lord, yet desired it, and when it was an accomplished fact they rejoiced beyond all utterance or conception. We are told by St. Paul in

1 Cor. xv. 7, "He was seen of James;" but we learn from John vii. 5, probably but a few months before His death, that "neither did His brethren believe in Him." It would appear that this "brother" of the Lord, who was afterwards the Bishop of Jerusalem did not, during the Lord's life-time, accept His claims to be the Messiah, but was converted to the truth by the resurrection. Again, we have the case of St. Thomas. He is a very misunderstood character. He has been profanely called the Apostle of unbelief, the type of the honest doubter. Now the infidel is one who rejoices to find some stumbling-stone, some argument against revelation. St. Thomas was, on the other hand, one who might rather be called the Apostle of enthusiasm. Nothing would have delighted him more than a sight of his dear Master; but when he heard only that He was risen, he thought the news was too good to be true, I can never believe such glad tidings of great joy, unless I see and feel for myself. And to him did the Lord grant the well-known appearance and rebuked the unbelief of one who would not accept the testimony of his friends. Last of all, the Lord manifested Himself to St. Paul, and that under most remarkable circumstances, Paul had just come fresh from the martyrdom of St. Stephen, his hands were still wet with the blood of the first martyr of the faith; he was charged with a commission of his own seeking from the High Priest and Sanhedrin to seize upon all, both men and women in the city of Damascus, who were disciples of the crucified. Lo! above the brightness of the Eastern mid-day sun the glory of the risen and ascended Jesus burst forth from the sky, the *shekinah* that had appeared to Moses in the bush, that had marched in the pillar of cloud before the people in the wilderness, that had appeared to the shepherds as they kept watch over their flocks by night, that had invested the Lord on the mount of transfiguration, and that shall appear on the last day when the Lord cometh in His Kingdom, that glory-light flashed before the eyes of the fallen man, and as it dimmed and dazzled his mortal sight kindled the light of life and truth within his heart, so that the Pharisee became a penitent, and the persecutor the praying saint, and he cried in agony of heart, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do." We have, then, before us every class of belief, misbelief and unbelief, represented, and each and all were convinced of the truth, the believers confirmed, the misbelievers set right, and the unbelievers turned from darkness to light. Now, in examining testimony as evidence for facts, the first thing to examine is whether there is a motive for the statements made. What will the witness gain by his asseverations? All these witnesses alike suffered for their testimony, they lost the love of relations and friends, they incurred dangers and persecutions, and many of them death in its most hideous forms—the scaffold, the stake, the wild beasts and the cross—and yet they insisted on the

truth of the things they "had seen and heard." If they had been prepared to have weakened and watered down these facts, to have given them a mystical interpretation; in short, written a nineteenth century article, there would have been few faggots lighted or crosses lifted up, but they believed and therefore did they speak, and because they spake they suffered.

There is another argument which all can appreciate. The effect which faith in the resurrection of the Lord has upon everyone who from the heart believes and receives that doctrine. It is true that this is a private and individual, a subjective experience, one with which a stranger intermeddleth not, and therefore may be objected to on the ground that one man's mental feelings are no rule for his neighbour, and furnish no proof or evidence of their truth or reality. But when we see the same effects follow in all cases, the argument derived from this fact assumes different and grander proportions. In every generation since the first Easter morning, in every country and tribe and tongue, among learned and unlearned, barbarians and civilised, in all types of character and in all the varying idiosyncrasies of men, the embracing of the doctrine of the death and resurrection of the Lord has produced a hatred of sin, a subjugation of evil passions, a holiness of heart and life, love to God and man, the putting forth of precious fruits, and the possession of a hope that is beautiful and bright and "full of immortality," we must therefore confess that these divinely-wrought energies in the secret chambers of the inner man array themselves with a vesture that is visible, and claim the force of a universal law.

II. Let us look at the resurrection of the Lord from another point of view. If this miracle stood alone there might be some difficulty in accepting it, or, at all events, the difficulty would be increased; but it does not stand alone. It is rather the end and climax of a series of signs and wonders if we regard it from the present stage of Divine revelation; and if we include the future, and take in the universe of a perfected and complete Christianity, then it will appear as the central link in the great chain of the ages, that binds together past and present, earth and heaven, time and eternity, man and God.

For our present purpose we will only calculate with the past, and deal with revelation in history. Assuming that the Incarnation is a fact, that the very Wisdom and Word of God, the only-begotten of the Father, took upon Him our nature, and became by the union of the Divine and human the God-Man, Christ Jesus, would not the resurrection be a real necessity? Would not such an One be incapable of being retained by death? Death could have no dominion over Him. Again, given that such an One came to be a Saviour, a conqueror of man's foes, and a Redeemer of the lost, would it not be a bounden necessity that He should over-

come the last enemy, death, and so prove His competency for His office—the Saviour of sinners? Once more, granting that the miracles detailed in the Gospel history are veracious narratives, did they not all lead up to this point?

Look at that blind man, who cries out for mercy and appeals to the pity and power of Jesus. What is blindness? It is the death of one of the organs of the body—a partial death. See, the Lord touches that dead organ, and immediately it starts into life, and light rushes through the unaccustomed channels to the centre of sense and perception, there is a partial death and a partial resurrection. Look again at the paralysed hand. What means that elongated, enervated limb? The nerves, the links of life, have lost vitality; the member is dead. A word goes forth from the quickening lips of the Lord, "Stretch forth thine hand." And lo! the hand is lifted up, the limb that was dead is alive again. That was partial death and partial resurrection. Such miracles as these are tokens and examples, promissory acts, as it were, of what was to follow. He that can do the one both can and will do the other. He who restores to life the part has power and will to quicken and rehabilitate the whole.

But more, Christ prefigured more directly His own resurrection by raising others from the dead, and His power was manifested in a graduated scale, so to speak, to prepare the minds of men step by step for the crown and climax of all—the resurrection of Himself. There is a child just dead; her heart-broken father pleads with Jesus, and implores Him to help in this hour of sore sorrow. "She sleeps," saith the Lord, and took her by the hand and lifted her back into life again. Another time Jesus and His disciples are walking on the road and approaching a little town, when their attention is arrested by a band of mourners conveying a dead man to his tomb. There is but one mourner, the mother and the widow. What pangs of sorrow pierce her heart, what floods of bitter tears stream down her face! "Stand still," said the voice of One who knows our sorrows, and the bearers stood still. "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise"; and the dead man sat up on the bier, and was in an instant clasped in his mother's arms.

Once again, the weeping sisters and their friends crowd around the recent sepulchre of a loved and loving brother. "Roll away the stone," said the voice of the Resurrection and the Life. "Nay," cried the sister, "he has been dead four days; it must not be, he stinketh." "Lazarus, come forth," echoed through the crowd, and responsive to the command the dead came forth, struggling with the grave-clothes that were bound around his limbs. Here, then, we have the child just dead, it may be but a few minutes; a young man who had departed life some twenty-four hours, and another who had lain dead for four whole days. By such stages, by such gradations in the exhibition

of His power and might, did the Lord prepare His disciples for the miracle of miracles, by which He was declared to be the Son God with power by the resurrection from the dead.

III. From the resurrection of our Lord there are lessons of importance to be derived for ourselves. The Corinthian heresy admitted the resurrection of Christ, but denied the resurrection of His people; to this was directed the Apostle's argument, that as Christ was risen so must His servants rise. To-day the heresy that is seeking acceptance denies the resurrection of Christ, and also that of the saints. The only resurrection is an elevation of thought and aim, a lifting of humanity to a higher platform of morals, and into an atmosphere of kindly sentiment and brotherly love. But the teaching of Scripture is that the resurrection of Christ is an historical and literal fact, and that the virtue of that risen life is infused by the Holy Spirit into all the members of the mystical body; hence there is in every true child of God a moral resurrection, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness." The man who has really accepted the doctrine has gone to the Cross and learned the mystery of sacrifice and love, has washed his sins away in the Blood of the Lamb; has received the Holy Spirit, and been raised by His power to newness of life, and is daily bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit, the very outcome and evidence of the resurrection of the Saviour and the moral resurrection of the saved.

This is the first step, but it is preparatory to a second stage in the divine life in man. "He that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." A literal resurrection awaits the saints at the second advent of their Lord. Jews and heathens believed in the immortality of the soul, but Christianity reveals the rising again of body as well as of soul. Just as the grain, bald and bare, is cast into the ground, and, passing through mysterious processes in the secret bosom of the earth, comes forth and reappears, the same, yet not the same, identity preserved, but conditions altered, in the golden grain; so the germ of the body, by latent and at present unrevealed processes, will come forth a spiritual body, a fit vehicle for the faculties of an immortal and imperishable state.

And further, this body thus risen shall require a vestment, a panoply of deathless protection; and this, we are told, shall be furnished in the robe of light and the investiture of glory, the *shekinah* of the transfiguration and the glory of the Saviour King, the glory which He received of the Father and hath covenanted to His people.

Oh, how different the now and the then! Now, poverty and pain and sickness and sorrow, the masterful agony, the burning heart and the bitter tears, remorseless disease and tyrant death, the dark shadow of sin, and the quakings of doubt and sometimes of despair. Then, pain and all its

retinue, the legions that sin hath enlisted in her armies, shall have been swept away for ever; God shall wipe away tears from off all faces. "Thy sins are forgiven thee" will be spoken with a trumpet peal, but with the tender music of the lips of love. Death, the last enemy, hath suffered death, and sin shall be no more. And peace shall pronounce her blessing, whose echoes shall float down the ages of eternity as a mighty rushing stream, and light shall flood the universe with an ocean of glory, unbounded and unquenchable.

Brethren, do we believe in the history of the past? Can we, do we, by faith revisit the cradle and accept the Incarnation? The Cross, and apply its healing blessing? The grave, and see its bars broken and the dead alive for ever more? And do we believe the prophetic future, and look forward to the promised return and the covenanted glory? O! be not faithless, but believing; so shall we, relying on the past, await the crisis and the kingdom, and His welcome home: "Come, ye blessed children of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you before the foundation of the world."

THE DANGER OF BEING "IN TOUCH" WITH THE LAITY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE WEBSTER, D.D.,
CHANCELLOR OF CORK, ETC.

SERMON PREACHED IN CORK CATHEDRAL, APRIL
7TH, 1889.

"But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."—2 COR. xi. 3.

I KNOW no modern phrase that has become so popular, and that is fraught with such mischief to the Church, as the phrase, "In touch with the laity." It represents a demand made by the laity upon the clergy, made by the laity of a voluntary Church—a Church supported, as it is now in Ireland, by the free-will offerings of the people—made by these pay-masters upon those who, although they are called of God to the high office of ministers in His Church, are after all mere human beings with all the infirmities of human beings—the appetites, desires, and even passions of human beings. I ask your serious attention to this important subject from the standpoint of the laity for a few moments whilst I endeavour to show the laity themselves the mischief they may be preparing for themselves and for their children. I have no time now to discuss the relative merits and demerits of the Endowed System as compared with the Voluntary System. For better or for worse the Church of Ireland must, I believe for a long time, put up with the evils of the Voluntary System.

Now, let it never be forgotten that the whole

system of Romanism rose under the Voluntary System, and from the demand on the part of the laity that the clergy should be "in touch" with them. No greater mistake could be made than the mistake of supposing that Romanism was the outcome of a crafty priesthood that sought to enslave and to crush down the heritage of Christ by all the snares of the Confessional, and of a purgatory the sufferings of which could be reduced by an absolution that could be purchased only by penance. The errors of Romanism have their roots in corrupt human nature, in a desire to avoid responsibility and to submit to any law except the most exacting of all laws, the law of love. All that the clergy did was to give shape and logical coherency to the errors that were cropping up in their multitudes from age to age in the minds of their pay-masters, the laity. Of course the clergy themselves were carried away by the popular currents of thought, and no doubt they entered warmly and sympathetically into the enthusiasm, such as it was, that seemed to inspire their flocks. By the way, I may observe how very hard it is in any age to find any movement that was inspired by human enthusiasm that did not owe its attractions to the *error* that was mixed up with the movement. Hard as it is, however, thank God, bad as the human family is, I believe some movements are recorded in history that commanded the holiest enthusiasm solely because of the truth that started them into existence. But to return: poisonous and deadly as were the errors of Romanism, I think common charity, to say nothing of the direct evidence of history, forces us to believe that the Schoolmen who handicapped the Gospel of Christ with their scholastic theology really did believe they were doing God's work. What chance would any independent thinker have had who struck out for himself, and warned the age in which he lived of the errors that were smothering pure Christianity, that were keeping the inspired Scriptures locked up in an unknown language in the libraries of the learned, and that were fast turning the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world, with the Pope of Rome as its earthly sovereign? Why, what chance would any poor clergyman have of being listened to who would now cry aloud and spare not, and lift up his voice against this modern infant Papacy, that began with the Lambeth Conference twenty years ago, with the Archbishop of Canterbury as a new Pope? Anyone who cares to study the question will see that a multitude of the influences that created the Pope at Rome are now busily at work in what is called "The Anglican Communion" to create a new Papacy in Canterbury.

I might, of course, enter into a thousand details referring to different questions to show you the danger of insisting upon having the clergy "in touch" with the laity, but I have thought it well to confine your attention to this gigantic proof of

the existence of such a danger. Of course every individual rector in his own parish has to deal with the peculiar movements that will keep him "in touch" with his flock, whilst he himself would perhaps rather be in touch with only a very few of his flock—that "little flock" in every generation that really belongs to Christ. It often happens, however, that the really pious man or woman, whose sympathies alone the pious clergyman seeks, is not the commanding spirit in that little congregation; nay, the real pious-minded person is often the one, and the only one, crushed out. The noisy and fussy busybodies are, of course, the leaders, and in one place these leaders will have nothing but teetotalism and tea parties and recitations and comic songs. In another place they will have nothing but extempore prayer-meetings and after-meetings and private confessionals. In another place they must have bazaars and brass bands and thinly-veiled lotteries in shooting galleries, in which, of course, a bow and arrow and a target are innocent representatives of Aunt Sally. In another place they must have subscription dances, the proceeds of which are to help the work of Jesus Christ. In another place, where, of course, the theatre is to be considered, the most unholy of all unholy places, a mock theatre, consisting of *tableaux vivants* and picturesque representations, will all be sanctified by the Word of God and by prayer, especially if the proceeds are devoted to some charitable purpose. Human nature is the same in all ages. Everything and everybody is sanctified if it brings money into the Church. The veriest ruffian is canonised if he gives enough of money to astonish the Church. The centurion might have loved the Jewish nation with intense love, and yet I fear the Jews would never have appreciated that love, nor have expressed their belief in his "worthiness," if he had not "built them a synagogue." My brethren, I ask you, in the name of God, what will be the end of all this in our day? Is this religion? Is it the religion of Christ? Does it really either create or sustain that serene communion with God which you believe to be the essence of true religion—that communion that supports you in the troubles and temptations of life, that will support you on the bed of pain and sickness, and that will be your true "joy and consolation" in the hour of death? If you want innocent amusement, in God's name have it. If you want to go to a ball or dance, then go if you can bring your Saviour with you, and if you can bring Him home with you as well. But why make this demand upon your clergyman—why tell him he must be "in touch" with you in such things, otherwise you will starve him? Perhaps he does not like these things at all. Perhaps after his day's toil he might like to spend as many evenings as he could with his wife and children; and, if he be unmarried, to spend these evenings in his study. I believe we clergy have one business in life, and

only one business, and that is to bring as many of you as we can to heaven. If we have secular Church business—and some of us have a great deal too much of it—we undertake such business simply because no one else will do it, and it is work that must be done by someone for our Master. But our prime work is spiritual work. As for penny readings and comic songs and recitations and bazaars and subscription dances and theatrical amusements and tea parties, we simply have nothing to do with such things; and, much as we may be injured if we submit to your demands in these matters, you, the laity, will be injured a great deal more. You will suffer in your spiritual history; the fine edge of true spirituality will be blunted, or, what is just as bad for you, will appear to be blunted in your clergy. You must be a very highly educated laity indeed if you care much to hear a man preaching on Sunday whom you heard singing a comic song in *public* on Saturday. I think I know nearly all that can be said on this subject. I know that there are thousands of things that are not sins in themselves, but become very close neighbours to sin in their border land, because of their gross incongruity. I entered very fully into all this discussion more than thirty years ago in this city in a lecture on “Amusements,” which then shocked your fathers, because they did not take the trouble to read my lecture. That lecture was delivered in this city in 1858. Fifteen years after that I was invited to deliver another lecture before your Young Men’s Society, and I lectured upon the same subject of “Amusements.” That lecture was never published, but in it I plainly condemned the amusements that were then sanctified by some religious exercises. Some high officer or officers of that Society resigned in 1873 because I was invited to deliver a lecture. In October, 1873, I promised to deliver another lecture fifteen years hence if God spared me. God did spare me, and I am very thankful I was not invited last October to deliver that third lecture on “Amusements.” I know well the influences at work that forbade the invitation, and the wickedness of these influences still at work in Cork is matched only by the folly of those whose mission it is to sustain them. These influences got some additional strength in 1862, more strength in 1864, still more in 1868, and their fullest strength in January, 1871. Think of the folly of any man who sets himself to gag me, with my pulpit in St. Nicolas and my pulpit here in this Cathedral occasionally in Cork. It is true it is one of my prime doctrines of morality to do everything constitutionally, and therefore to have nothing to do with parties or leagues or secret meetings or caucus contrivances. Men who act constitutionally have all the weakness of God and righteousness to bear for a while, but only for a while, because God in the end will be the Victor. Dear brethren, as regards amusements I say nothing new. I could not say there would be anything

sinful, but there certainly would be something disgustingly incongruous in the conduct of one of the Judges of Assize if he jumped out of his carriage with his robes as he was passing the Corn Market, and danced a jig on the pavement, whilst some jolly fiddler supported his enthusiasm. I confess, too, that a dancing bishop, with or without his robes, could not command much of my admiration, even though by such a piece of mountebankism he put himself very much in touch with the laity. Well, now, dear brethren, do not ask your pastors to do anything incongruous, anything not quite in keeping with their most holy associations merely to keep themselves “in touch” with you. Do not threaten them with not paying your assessments if, instead of keeping themselves in touch with you, they boldly rebuke vice and suffer for the truth’s sake. Do not try and bring about again the wonderful and horrible thing that God by His prophet condemned. “A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land; the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and my people love to have it so.” If the people love to be beguiled by the serpent, the devil will have very easy work before him.

THE Duke of Cleveland has given £500 towards the restoration of Barningham Church, Barnard Castle.

THE Most Rev. Robert Bent Knox, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of the Church of Ireland, who was born at Dungannon Park, county Tyrone, completed his eighty-first year on the 25th inst.

SERMONS in connection with the Church Congress at Cardiff will be preached in Swansea on Sunday by Archdeacon Emery, Canon G. Venables, late vicar of Great Yarmouth, and the Rev. Charles Mackeson, minister of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Mansfield-road, London.

THE Bishop of St. David’s intends to hold his general ordination on Saturday, the 21st December next (being St. Thomas’s Day). Candidates are to apply to the Bishop for permission to offer themselves as early as possible, and not later than the 20th November. The examination will be held in the week immediately preceding the ordination. Application should be made for information respecting the subjects of examination to Canon Bevan Hay, R.S.O., or to Canon Gregory Smith, Vicarage, Great Malvern, (the Bishop’s examining chaplains), and respecting legal forms and necessary papers to the Bishop’s secretary, Mr. John H. Barker, 2, Notts-square, Carmarthen. All necessary papers should be in the secretary’s hands on or before the 30th of November. The Bishop of St. David’s will henceforth hold general ordinations at Advent and Trinity, instead of in Lent and September. No general ordination will be held in Lent, 1890.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years’ standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

**PAMPHLET
and Advice
FREE**

Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to **MR. C. B. HARNESSE,** Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his New Medical Work, entitled "**Harnesse's Guide to Health,**" which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harnesse's Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. **MR. C. B. HARNESSE** also gives Advice (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1889.

OVERCROWDED CEMETERIES.

THE Church of England Burial Reform Association has been *en evidence* of late, and its objects are now very widely known, not only in the British Isles but also across the Atlantic. Last year the honorary secretary visited Canada and the United States for the purpose of spreading the movement there on Church lines, and was well received, and met with much success.

This year the Association has drawn up seven "Specific Proposals," which were embodied in a letter addressed to the Press by the Dean of York, Chairman of the Council. Many of the Bishops, together with Lord Randolph Churchill and others, have signified their full approval of these proposals. Arrangements have now been made for a series of Conferences, the first of which is to be held in Cardiff on the Monday in Congress week.

Much of the interest in this question, which has been lately aroused in the public mind, is due to the Association having obtained from the Home Office returns as to the condition of the Metropolitan cemeteries, which revealed a condition of things fraught with danger to the public health. The Council now propose to approach Lord Salisbury with a view to prevailing upon the Government to take the matter up. The Association is essentially a Church Society, and all its proposed reforms are on thoroughly Prayer Book lines.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROCK.

SIR,—In view of the conferences on burial reform to be held during the Church Congress, in Cardiff, on September

30th; in the Council Chamber, Oxford, on October 8th; at the Church House, Westminster, on October 10th; in the Council Chamber, Cambridge, on October 15th; and at Armagh, Belfast, Londonderry, Cork, and elsewhere, kindly permit me to point out that the Burial Service in our Book of Common Prayer offers suggestions of a mode of disposing of the dead which has been declared by scientific men to be in accordance with sound science and sanitary law, and which, if properly and completely carried out, renders overcrowding impossible. The rubric: "The priests and clerks meeting the corpse, and going before it either into the church or towards the grave," permits the body, when there is danger of infection, to be taken direct to its burial instead of into the church. The rubric: "While the body is made ready to be laid into the earth," points to an interment of the body in as close contact with the earth as circumstances, decency, and reverence permit. Another rubric: "While the earth is being cast upon the body by some standing by," seems to imply that the body is to be surrounded and covered with sufficiency of earth. The mode of burial indicated by these rubrics in the "Order for the Burial of the Dead" in the Prayer Book is harmless to the living. If the coffin be of a perishable nature, if the soil be dry and porous, if the graves be not too crowded, the dead are resolved into air and ashes in from three to seven years, and this without injury to the living.

Now, if the Burial Service manifestly enjoins a mode of disposing of the dead which is in conformity with sanitary laws, it may be inferred that all other supplementary, or exceptionally necessary, sanitary precautions are to be welcomed and acted upon. Mourners are not expected to do anything, or leave anything undone, to the imperilling of their own welfare or that of the public at large. It should be considered a pious duty to bury as soon after death as signs of dissolution appear. The coffin should be of some readily-perishable material. If the presence of infectious germs be suspected, some chemical compound capable of destroying such germs should be placed in the coffin as soon after death as possible. The placing of the body in a properly-appointed mortuary near the burying-place should be considered to show as much respect as following it with a costly procession through the crowded streets. The disease-carrying pall should be discarded. The grave should be so shallow as that the air be not excluded. When the soil of the cemetery is not suitable for the disintegration of human remains, [the grave should be filled up with dry, porous, properly-prepared earth. Bricked graves and vaults, which retain the body in a state of arrested decomposition, should be abandoned. The surface of the grave should not be covered with slabs or monuments preventing the growth of plants and excluding the air. Suitable vegetation should abound. Only when assured of the complete dissolution and redistribution of the first should a second body be interred in the same earth. Graveyards should be gardens where the dead are buried side by side, each succession of human bodies passing away into air and ashes, the earth being thus ready every succeeding generation to perform its beneficent action again. Thus natural laws will have been observed, and the earth, which is the best deodorizer and antiseptic known, and the receptacle of all creatures which have lived and died, will have acted as the medium through which the air descends and performs its purifying and disintegrating action, to re-ascend in new combinations and nourish fresh life.

I crave, therefore, the moral and practical support of your readers on behalf of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association, whose aim is to abolish the prevalent, improper, imperfect, falsely so-called burial in durable coffins, in vaults, or already crowded graves; and to substitute the Church's "earth to earth" mode of burial, in a readily-perishable coffin of compressed pulp, or the like, as carried out by the Necropolis Company at the Woking Cemetery. Under this system not only is the natural chemical combustion of the body brought about with harm to none, and over-crowding made impossible, but also other distinct and definite advantages accrue; the funeral ceremonies are simplified, the expense lessened, and the same

earth rendered available for the burial of the dead, generation after generation, for all time to come.

I am, your obedient servant,

ARTHUR P. PUREY-CUST, D.D.,

Chairman of the Council.

Deanery, York.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

THE Reunion of Christendom is to many minds an attractive hope or dream. To religious persons, the existing divisions seem to defeat one of the chief objects of Jesus Christ, which they believe to have been to draw all mankind together into one united brotherhood. Those, on the other hand, who view religion merely as a moralising and civilising influence, are most struck by the waste of power produced by the necessity, which division creates, of maintaining a number of agencies in every country, town, or village to do the work which might easily be done by one; and, still more, by the evident fact, that a large part of the strength of every one of these agencies is spent in counterworking, frustrating, and, if possible, ousting the others. The religious person thinks, If the Church were one, it would be powerful enough to master the evil of the world, and to unite the human race to each other and to their God: the more secular minded thinks, that the moralising functions of religion would be performed more completely, and at much less expense, by one united body: but both agree in thinking that the state of division and opposition, which at present exists in Christendom, cannot be justified.

Hence proposals for reunion have proceeded from different quarters, but chiefly from members and officials of the Anglican Church. Various causes combine to bring the subject strongly before the mind of this particular religious body. Its central position seems to many of its members to qualify it to act the part of a mediator, and suggests to them the idea that it may perhaps prove to be the predestined nucleus, around which the scattered fragments of Christendom may collect and crystallize. The spirit of compromise, or opportunism, which has been visible through all its history, and never more conspicuously than now, appears also to qualify it to be the instrument of a still wider comprehension. Its connection with the œcumenical British empire inspires it with an œcumenical ambition. But, most of all, its conscious weakness tends to increase the desire for reunion. It alone, of all national churches, has lost the allegiance of the greater part of those peoples, of whom it was once the acknowledged spiritual mother. It can claim, as its adherents, a clear majority of the population in no English-speaking country except England. In Wales it is a minority, in Scotland a minute fraction, in Ireland not quite one-eighth of the whole population. In the Colonies it is outnumbered by Nonconformists, Protestant or Roman, everywhere, except in little Barbados and microscopic St. Helena. In the United States, it is one of several powerful religious communities, by more than one of which singly it is surpassed in numbers, in influence, and even in intellectual cultivation. On the mission field it is not more zealous, nor more successful, than other religious bodies, which it is too ready to treat as rivals and inferiors.

Notwithstanding these enormous losses, and this weakened position, the Anglican Church has abated

none of its pretensions; and would fain be accepted still as the only authentic body, amongst the nations of British origin, secure in the possession of spiritual graces, and recognised by the Founder of Christianity as His own. No wonder that this Church desires very earnestly to diminish, if it were possible, the immense discrepancy which exists between its pretensions and its actual position, by attracting other religious bodies into union.

Hence Reunion has become a subject of discussion in all Anglican assemblies. There have been movements in this direction in both the English Convocations, and in Australian and Canadian Synods; but the first attempt at naming definite terms, on which such reunion might possibly be effected, was made by the General Assembly of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America in the year 1886. This body placed before the world a Resolution containing Four Articles. These were, in 1888, considered by a Committee of the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops, and were, with certain modifications, reported upon favourably by that Committee, adopted unanimously by the assembled prelates, and embodied in their encyclical. Thus, there is a definite proposal before the world emanating from that body, which, from its position and peculiarities, is best qualified to take such a step. That proposal is contained in the following resolution:—

“That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God’s blessing made towards Home Reunion:—

“(A.) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as ‘containing all things necessary to salvation,’ and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

“(B.) The Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

“(C.) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

“(D.) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.”

The fundamental principle, on which these Four Articles are based, is thus stated by the Committee which had previously sat on Home Reunion, adopting phraseology already used by the American Convention:—

“The Church did not seek to absorb other communions, but to co-operate with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order, to discountenance Schism, and to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ; and that she was prepared to make all concessions on all things of human ordering and human choice,” while it was her duty “to preserve, as inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church, and as therefore essential to the restoration of unity,” the particulars contained in the four preceding Articles, viz.: (1) The Holy Scriptures, (2) The Apostles’ and the Nicene Creed, (3) The Two Sacraments, and (4) The Historic Episcopate.

Such was the ostensible outcome of the bishops’ deliberations on the re-establishment of Unity. But, in publishing this result to the world, those prelates committed an action, which we must take the liberty of calling

exceedingly disingenuous. They concealed the fact, that the Committee appointed to consider the subject of Home Reunion had presented a previous report, which contained a recommendation* to recognise, under certain conditions, Presbyterian orders. This proposal was indeed made timidly, and only as a temporary measure; but it *was* made; and that by a Committee composed largely of American and Colonial Bishops—men who must, every day of their lives, be reminded of the extreme absurdity, as well as uncharitableness, of treating the majority of the good Christians, with whom they hold daily intercourse, as men destitute of a covenant title to the grace of God, and outside of the Church of Christ.

We venture to protest most earnestly against the suppression of this report, and generally against the conduct of these conferences with closed doors and without reporters. In deliberative bodies, publicity and openness is a necessary condition of general confidence; nor would the decisions of those General Councils, to which Anglican prelates appeal as authorities ever have obtained universal acceptance, if their discussions had not been open to the world, so that the public could see distinctly not only the conclusions arrived at, but the whole process of discussion by which they were reached.

We will, however, only deal with those proposals which the Conference has thought politic to publish. Of the Four Articles, two, (A and C), would be admitted without much discussion, by the great majority of Protestant Christians; and the crucial points would be found to be (B and D) the Creeds, and the Episcopate.

It will be seen that the Conference still adheres nominally to the fundamental proposition of all Protestant Churches, that "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation;" and, in so doing, takes its stand upon the original Christianity of Jesus Christ, as opposed to the developed Christianity, evolved in later ages under the various influences of the world. Notwithstanding this professed adherence to an exclusively Scriptural foundation, the bishops not only maintain themselves (which they have a perfect right to do), but also attempt to impose on others as a necessary condition of inter-communion two doctrinal formularies, which are certainly not contained in Holy Scripture, nor are parts of original Christianity; and also a form of ecclesiastical organisation, which was admittedly unknown in the earlier part of the Apostolic age, and which is unmentioned in Holy Writ.

Now no one can dispute the right of Anglican prelates to use within their own communion that creed of Constantinople (A.D. 381), or of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), whichever it may be, which passes under the

name of the Nicene Creed. It is a document of the fourth and fifth centuries, the work of men of that period, and the embodiment of opinions then prevailing; and as such it cannot be elevated into a condition necessary for salvation, or for communion, by a Church which professes to found itself entirely on the original Christianity of the New Testament. The same must be said of the so-called Apostles' Creed, an occidental document, which, though its principal lines are far more ancient, did not finally assume its present form until the fifth, and possibly even the sixth, century. No one objects to the use of either of these formularies by members of the Anglican Church, or wishes them to be expunged out of the Liturgy or Articles. The bishops can, without any objection or protest from other religious bodies, hold, and recite, and teach, and recommend them, as much as they please, to their own members. But if they exalt into conditions of communion documents, which are no part of the original deposit of Christian doctrine, they not only violate their own first principle, but also bar the Church door against many who have a right to enter, and are so far guilty of the division of Christendom.

They profess themselves "prepared to make all concessions on all things of human ordering and human choice," and only desirous "to preserve the inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church." Yet they cannot deny that the Creed of Constantinople, and the so-called Apostles' Creed, are things of human ordering and human choice, nor that both of those documents, and some of the phraseology and propositions which they contain, were unknown to Christ and His Apostles. It is, doubtless, characteristically Anglican to attempt to stand at the same moment on original Christianity and on that of the fourth century. But historical research has demonstrated that these are two different, and in some respects discordant, things. The time is past, when an ecclesiastical body could balance itself unconsciously on two incompatible foundations. And the Anglican body, notwithstanding its constitutional tendency to opportunism and compromise, will be compelled to elect upon which of the two it means to stand.

The other point, which the Lambeth prelates hold to be essential, is what they call "the Historic Episcopate." Now this is a very ambiguous term; for no institution has suffered greater changes in the course of centuries than the episcopal organisation of the Church. From the presbyter-bishops, holding co-ordinate authority over congregations in the apostolic age, through the independent episcopal *ἐπίσκοποι*, whom the writer of the Ignatian letters desired to see established in every town, and the Byzantine system, prevailing in the time of Constantine and his successors, of a hierarchy of bishops, metropolitans, exarchs, patriarchs, modelled on Diocletian's secular organisation of the empire, to the despotic papacy of Innocent III., the distances traversed are enormous. Yet all these officials were bishops; and the institutions, of which they formed a part, are all included in historic episcopacy. If the Anglican bishops are disposed to comprehend all these gradations under their phrase, they have prepared a ready way of reconciliation with the Presbyterians; for beyond all doubt, the first form of the historic episcopate resembled the presbyterian mode of organisation more closely than any other existing form of Church government. But we fear that this is precisely what they do not want to do. The first care of a hierarchy is always to maintain its own exclusive claims: nor

* The recommendation is contained in the following resolution, which was submitted by the Committee to the Conference. "That in the opinion of this Committee, conferences such as we have recommended are likely to be fruitful, under God's blessing, of practical result only if undertaken with willingness on behalf of the Anglican Communion, while holding firmly the three-fold order of the Ministry as the normal rule of the Church to be observed in future—to recognize, in spite of what we must conceive as irregularity, the ministerial character of those ordained in non-episcopal communions, through whom, as Ministers, it has pleased God visibly to work for the salvation of souls, and the advancement of His kingdom; and to provide, in such way as may be agreed upon, for the acceptance of such Ministers as fellow-workers with us in the service of the Lord Jesus Christ." "The Lambeth Conference and Church Reunion," a Charge by Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrew's, p. 12.

have the majority of the prelates of the Anglican Church the slightest intention of accepting from their non-episcopal fellow-Christians anything but unconditional surrender. They invite men, whose ministry has received the seal of the Great High Priest of the Christian profession in the bestowal upon them of the highest and noblest *charisms*, to come and crouch to them for those gifts of God which they have long ago received direct from Him, as if such gifts could come only through a bishop's hand. Is it to be expected that any men will dishonour themselves, and their ministry, and the communities in which they have lived and done noble service, by stooping to such conditions? We are of opinion that a better course is open, if only Anglican prelates will submit to those facts of history to which nominally they appeal.

The historic basis of the episcopate is gradually becoming clear. It is no longer asserted that either Jesus Christ himself or his Apostles drew up a constitution for the infant Church: but it is admitted that each of its offices came into being separately and singly, as called for by the exigencies of the times. It is conceded, that in the first part of the Apostolic age, monarchical episcopacy was unknown. Bishop and presbyter were then two titles of one office, and these presbyter-bishops exercised all their functions collectively; nor is a vestige of a monarchical institution, beyond that personal influence, which strength of character threw into the hands of individuals like James or Paul, to be found in early Apostolic Christendom. Neither Peter nor Paul ever saw a bishop ruling singly in a Church. Ordination was then exercised by the Apostles, but not by them only; for, when the Holy Ghost within them made known to certain prophets and teachers that apostles of the Gentiles were required, these persons did not scruple to ordain a thirteenth and a fourteenth apostle in the persons of Saul and Barnabas—an ordination more pregnant with important consequences than any that either preceded or followed it (Acts xiii. 1-3). In what is commonly called the sub-apostolic age (A.D. 70-100), monarchical episcopacy was in most places still unknown—unknown to Clement, unknown to the author of the “Didache,” and to all the other authors of the fragmentary literature of the period, except the one who writes under the name of “Ignatius,” whose ruling motive is a fanatical eagerness to procure the adoption of that form of organisation everywhere. On the other hand, in the latter half of the second century, monarchical episcopacy is found established throughout the Christian world. In the interval between the Apostles’ age and this latter date, the historic episcopate (as the bishops understand these words) was born (A.D. 70-170). Its advance was rapid, and its victory complete and durable; and the time seems short for the operation of so great a change. But it is to be remembered, that at that time monarchy was in the air. It took only half as long a time (B.C. 80-30) to convert the democratic republic of Rome into the despotic monarchy of the Cæsars; yet, in this latter case, the work was equally complete, for in the Roman State democratic institutions never raised their heads again, just as in the Christian Church there was never any return towards primitive liberty until the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century.

Thus the conversion of the primitive Christian democracies into monarchies was the work of about a century (A.D. 70—170); and episcopacy, having been universal from the latter of those dates to the period of the Reformation, and being still the prevailing form

of ecclesiastical organisation, can plead a prescription of more than seventeen centuries, which at least entitles it to the first place among “those powers that be,” which God has ordained in the course of His providential government of the Church. It cannot trace its pedigree to Christ Himself, nor even to those Apostles who were removed from the world in Nero’s time. It may possibly have had the Apostle John for its author, but that point cannot at present, and probably never will be, clearly proved. But it certainly reaches back within 150, and possibly within 100 years of the origin of Christianity. Surely the bishops might be content with a position so splendid, and not pretend to the possession of a peculiar Apostolic *virus*, which can only be communicated by the application of their hands—a pretension which degrades their high dignity, by mixing it with superstition, not to say with charlatanism.

If, however, they do make this claim, they are met face to face by another series of facts, which are equally the appointment of the Deity Himself, and are fatal to their exclusive pretensions. Since the great catastrophe of the Reformation, it has been abundantly demonstrated that that grace of God which qualifies men for the highest functions of the Christian ministry is not tied to the imposition of episcopal hands. The founder of Christianity Himself declared the test by which the false pretender to a mission from above may be distinguished from the true. And this criterion was not a genealogy of prelates consecrated by prelates, but the fruits that are visible to all men: “By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles.” (Matt. vii. 15—18.) Judged by this test, many an irregular prophet or teacher has a higher credential to show, issued directly from the Highest Power, than any document bearing the seal of a diocese. His work and his character are his commendatory epistles, each known and read of all men, each sealed with the seal of the Divine Spirit. The gifts of that Spirit are declarations of the Deity Himself in favour of their possessor, which no pretender to exclusive authority can controvert, without committing that sin against the Holy Ghost, which is unpardonable.

Under the providential government of the world, the Christian Church has resolved itself into several independent organisations. Instead of this loss of organic unity being an evil to be deplored, it is one of the greatest blessings ever bestowed upon mankind. A strong hierarchy cannot help being intolerant and tyrannical. Now, as in the days of the great Popes, a strongly-organised Catholic Church, spread over all the world, and embracing all mankind, would be a colossal tyranny, against whose cage of iron bars all freedom of mind or of action would dash itself in vain. It is only the balance of power among independent religious communities, which prevents persecution, guarantees freedom of thought and inquiry, and thereby supports in religion both subjective veracity and objective truth. The existence of separate organisations should be frankly acknowledged as a good, and not an evil—in fact, as an ordinance of God. And, then, abandoning the delusive dream of restoring an organic unity, which would be a curse and not a blessing, let Christian people make every effort to promote friendly feeling and co-operation, and, as the crown of all, intercommunion between Christian organisations and Christian individuals. If, instead of indulging in ambitious dreams of spiritual conquest and empire, the various Anglican assemblies and pre-

lates would take as their aim the establishment of a friendly alliance of free Christian bodies, they would find their central position the best possible starting-point from which to pursue that noble object; and Archbishop Benson might possibly find himself recognised by most Protestants, not quite as *papa alterius orbis*, but at least as *primus inter pares*.

Nor should it ever be forgotten that the guilt of schism rests, not on those who claim and use that liberty which is the birthright of every Christian, but on those who advance exclusive claims, which nothing in original Christianity, or in the course of history, or in the present state of the Christian world, can justify—first on the asserters of the Papal despotism, and secondly on those who are attempting to revive the exclusive pretensions of episcopacy.

This is a matter for the consideration not only of clerical dignitaries, and ministers, and members of ecclesiastical assemblies. The laity of every denomination has the power and the duty to take an active part, not only in promoting, but also in actually effecting the reunion of the Church. Christian bodies, which admit each other's members to communion, are no longer in schism, although they be not members of the same organic body. If, therefore, the religious laity wish the Church to be reunited, let them communicate not only with the religious body, of which they profess to be actual members, but also with such other bodies as they believe to possess, in common with themselves, the vital parts of Christianity. At least, let them do so as far as those bodies will admit them; for it is to be feared that, when this experiment is tried, no Christian body will be found to have a monopoly of intolerance. Encouraging examples may, however, be quoted, in which the experiment has been tried with success. There is at least, one eminent lady, who not only selects her chaplains, both from Episcopal and from Presbyterian communions, but also communicates in the little parish church of Crathie, as well as in the gorgeous fane of Windsor. And that lady—not the archbishop—is the supreme head of the Church of England. There is no inconsistency in such inter-communion. He who adopts this practice, professes that he himself is neither Episcopalian nor Presbyterian; he asserts his belief that neither Episcopacy nor Presbytery is a part of the essence of Christianity; that each is a thing of human ordering and human choice; and that a difference respecting them ought not to be allowed to keep Christian brethren asunder.

W. E. RAWSTORNE.

In the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25 Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year; this article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE RIGORIST DOCTRINE OF FASTING COMMUNION UNREASONABLE; UNSUPPORTED BY HOLY SCRIPTURE; UNHISTORICAL AND UNTHEOLOGICAL. A REMONSTRANCE." By an English Priest. Plymouth: W. F. Westcott. Pp. 45.

WITH one somewhat serious exception, we have nothing but praise for this timely protest. In making a firm stand against the attempt which is being made by some Ritualists to force upon members of the English Church the rigorism of the Church of Rome, the writer goes out of his way to make concessions to Roman claims with which we have no sympathy whatever, and which seem to us (to adopt his own language) "unreasonable, unsupported by Holy Scripture, unhistorical and untheological." That, prior to the fatal errors by which he has been self-deposed, the Bishop of Rome was the visible constitutional head of the Church, and would become such again, if he were to purge himself of these errors, is a position which for us is absolutely untenable; but the fact that the writer of this pamphlet holds it, makes the remonstrance which he administers to his Romanising brethren all the more remarkable and emphatic.

Among the many ill-advised things which the more advanced among the Ritualists are doing at the present time, is enforcing on all who will yield to them the rule of Fasting Communion, not merely as the "more excellent way" for all who are strong enough to observe it without physical distress, but as binding on everyone, whether weak or strong. "If you cannot receive the Holy Communion fasting, you had better not receive at all," is the doctrine which is now not merely privately inculcated, but openly preached from the pulpit; and we are grateful to one who evidently in many things sympathises with those whom he thus severely rebukes, for lifting up his voice against this doctrine. His own position is pretty much that of Waterland, whom he quotes: "The rule (of coming fasting to the Lord's Table) was early *almost* universal—a rule of the Church, not a rule of Scripture—and so rather a matter of Christian liberty than of strict command. They that use it as more expressive of Christian humility and reverence, and as a help to devotion, do well; and they that forbear it either on account of infirmity, or for fear of being indisposed, or rendered unfit to attend to the service, are not to be blamed." (Vol. vii., p. 44).

In the Appendix are some useful quotations from Augustine, and other primitive writers. We select one from the first of St. Augustine's epistles to Januarius: "I have often perceived with deep grief and sorrow that many disquietudes of weak souls are brought about by the contentious obstinacy or the superstitious timidity of some, who in matters of this kind (which admit of no final decision, either by the authority of Holy Scripture, or by tradition of the Universal Church, or by their utility for amendment of life) *urge controversies with such dogmatism, that they think nothing right but what they do themselves; and that simply because they have got some crotchet in their heads, or because such has been the custom in their own country.* . . . Such men violate their own peace and quietness by quarrelling about an unnecessary question."

We recommend our readers to spend sixpence in procuring this useful discussion of a question which in some places has become a burning one.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—The letter of "J. B." in the PULPIT of the 6th inst. amounts to the following items:—

1. That it fits him to pass over in silence the refutation of his theory given in my letters, and to re-assert his belief without proof, in the hope that such repeated assertion will pass for argument with your readers, whom he fancies to be as unskilful in the word of truth as himself.

2. That the more tender a person's sensibilities become, the less punishment are they likely to put upon sin, and consequently that God, being infinitely tender, will put no punishment at all upon it!

3. That he does not believe that Paul was a man of tender sensibilities when he wrote that certain people would be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord!"

4. That what he calls "tender sensibilities" are not such, in the proper acceptation of those words, but rather a disposition to grant indulgence to the committing of sin.

5. That all men are cruel who do not believe his doctrine of purgatorial correction.

6. That *because* slavery is a cruel thing, it is *also* cruel in the Almighty to punish sin with eternal punishment.

7. That though the men who carried on slavery had nothing to do with the introducing or inventing of the doctrine of everlasting punishment, yet it suits "J. B." to mix the two up together, on the principle that any trick is good enough for his purpose.

8. That because he says the age which gave us the doctrine of everlasting punishment being "a still darker era," it follows that Christ, who first enunciated the doctrine, and the Apostles who preached it, were cruel men!

9. That he would be more benevolent than the Christ, because that while the latter attaches everlasting punishment to the finally impenitent, he would only give them a limited period, and that not punishment, but only the purificatory process of a purgatorial fire.

10. That he has invented a model of government for the Deity, because, while the Almighty governs the world by rewards and punishments, he would banish all punishment, and reward every one after a "limited period" of purifying castigation.

11. That though the four hundred prophets who prophesied the same thing before Ahab (1 Kings xxii.) did not make that true which was false, yet "J. B." quotes certain bishops, deans, and canons, who, he says, are sailing in the same boat with him, as if their united chorus could drown the voice of divine truth!

12. That though the happiness of heaven consists essentially in doing the will of God, yet "J. B." would make it consist in the reverse of this by representing that it consists in putting forth efforts for the salvation of those whom God has declared shall not be saved.

13. That his talk about cruel ages, dark eras, tender sensibilities, and kindly sympathies, is only a lame attempt to go *behind* a plain text of Scripture.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, September 14th, 1889.

THE Bishop of Dover, respecting whose recovery a paragraph has been lately published in the papers, is making slow progress, but we regret to say that his health is not yet completely restored. His November confirmations will be taken by Bishop Mitchinson.

A LARGE number of workmen are engaged in extending and improving the premises of the Church House, in Dean's-yard, Westminster. Three buildings are being thrown into one, an ingenious arrangement providing a commodious hall to seat nearly two hundred persons. The library and reading rooms will be on the ground floor, and half a dozen smaller rooms for general purposes will occupy the floors above. Already the library numbers about 5,000 volumes. The house will be reopened at the end of next month.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Banning, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Strood; Rural Dean of Rochester.

Beal, Rev. S. G., Domestic Chaplain at Glamis Castle; Rector of Romaldkirk, Darlington.

Bentley, Rev. Robert, B.A., Vicar of Hatfield, Herefordshire.

Clayton, Rev. A. P., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Ventnor.

Couchman, Rev. C. E., M.A., Vicar of Sibbertoft, Market Harborough.

Dixon, Rev. J., M.A., Sub-Warden and Chaplain of St. Peter's Home and Sisterhood, Mortimer Road, Kilburn.

Edwards, Rev. Basil, M.A., Vicar of Ashelworth, Gloucestershire.

Edwards, Rev. John, Rector of Stonton Wyville, Leicestershire. Evans, Rev. Herbert Massey Myddleton, B.A., Rector of Covey, Cambridgeshire.

Fanshawe, Rev. W. D., M.A., Vicar of St. Jude's, Gray's-inn Road; Deputy Priest-in-Waiting at the Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace.

Grant, Rev. F. B., Vicar of Wolverlow, Herefordshire.

Hammond, Rev. C. E., M.A., Vicar of Menheniot; Rural Dean of East.

Jacques, Rev. Kinton, M.A., Vicar of West Houghton; Rector of Brindle, near Chorley.

James, Rev. David, M.A., Rector of Billing Parva, Northamptonshire.

Keble, Rev. G. C., M.A., Rector of Little Hinton, Wilts.

Maddy, Rev. H. W., M.A., Hon. Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

Richards, Rev. Thomas Parry, B.A., Assistant-Chaplain of the Guild Chapel, Stratford-on-Avon.

Rigby, Rev. F. W. C., Chaplain of Mildmay Deaconesses' House.

Shaw, Rev. G. W. H., M.A., Curate of St. Margaret's, Ilkley; Vicar of Thornthwaite-with-Braithwaite, near Keswick.

Spencer, Rev. W. M., Minister of St. John-the-Baptist, Holland Road, Kensington.

Stockler, Rev. A. H., M.A., Rector of Ovington, Hants.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Crowdy, Rev. Anthony, M.A., for some years Rector of Winnall, Winchester, and subsequently of Titsey, at Bankton, Crawley Down, on the 18th inst., aged 87.

Duthy, Rev. William, at Sudborough Rectory, on the 11th inst., aged 93.

Green, Rev. Martin Johnson, B.D., forty-one years Rector of Winterbourne Abbas with Winterbourne Steepleton, Canon of Sarum, and late Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, at Steepleton Rectory, Dorchester, Dorset, on the 17th inst., aged 75.

Manley, Rev. W. G., M.A., late Curate at Leeds Parish Church, at Dunsdale, Bournemouth, on the 14th inst., aged 28.

Shadwell, Rev. Julius, suddenly, at Lower Rickingham Rectory, Suffolk, on the 22nd inst., aged 67.

Smyth, Rev. Henry Metcalfe, M.A., Chaplain of Seckford's Hospital, Woodbridge, at Woodbridge, on the 18th inst., aged 57.

Sparks, Rev. Clement J., Priest of the Universities Mission to Central Africa, at Zanzibar.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY.

BY THE REV. J. GEORGE GIBSON, SENIOR
ASSOCIATE OF THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE
OF SCOTLAND, CURATE OF THE PARISH OF
ROYTON, LANCASHIRE.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF
ST. MARY, PRESTON, LANCASHIRE, ON THE
SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

"... And how shall they hear without a preacher?
And how shall they preach except they be sent?"—ROMANS
x. (part of verses) 14, 15.

THIS is an age of discovery, but also one of mistakes; of advance in matters scientific and theological; but also of error, false premises, and uncertain resultants.

All reform, all development even, is, in the nascent state, somewhat liable to the operation of influences for or against its higher stages — its full success.—And wherever success is less than complete, where fact is as yet only foreshadowed by probabilities, where the position of infallibility must perforce be denied to the highest intellect and the most devout labour and worship of scientific faculty, there is ever a counterblast to the trumpet of the excited discoverer, always a doubt lurking in the strongest assertion of certainty—an indescribable something which produces "chaos worse confused" in moral, intellectual, and spiritual spheres of activity.

Hence the finest art of the logician is joined with the stores of knowledge in a never ending tournament of words, which allure, or please, or half convince; but nothing more — leaving the mind and heart rising and falling, travelling or receding as the billow shall heave or the wind of doctrine blow, or the tide of feeling or opinion flow.

In this condition were the early disciples of our Blessed Lord when, agitated in mind, lost for reasons, they were asked, "Would they also go away?" And only because a new and living way out of the difficulties of the mind was presented,—only because they realised the marvellous magnetic power of the master soul,—only because they had in a measure learned to look unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of their Faith, were they constrained,—putting for once the unsolved problem on one side,—to say, "Lord, to whom shall we go,—for Thou hast the words of eternal life?"

We have new philosophies, new evolutions (so
Vol. XXVIII.—No. 719.

regarded) of Christian force and creed, flooding all homes and all peoples with the dark uncertain spirits of confusion and licence. But none can answer the question of the human needs, and none can fill with hope and courage the feeblest or the most brightly cultured devotee. And upon this certain though ill-defined result of all attempts to patch up the wounded spirit of mankind, St. Paul throws considerable light in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians: "It is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" "For after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom. But we preach Christ crucified."

And we find in these later days a very similar effect when the cause is the same. The men of power, the forces which overcome bigotry and prejudice, which tame the savage and convince the mind and soul of the unwise learned, are not found in the Lecture Hall, in the Schools, in the Academic Chairs, but in the daily Pulpit of Christian Heraldry, in the life and word of assertion, in the proclamation of what we believe and are sure is the truth of God,—although the proof of any of our statements is difficult to make good.

While allowing and conceding to the Apologete all the praise which is suitable — and that, for his work's sake is no little thing—we are yet constrained to note that the voice which affects belief, which convinces the doubting inquirer, which triumphs over every objection and brings the penitent sinner to the foot of the Cross in adoring faith, is not that of the philosopher, nor that of the logician, nor that of the school man, but the simple foolishness of unsupported assertion, the proclamation of the truth as it is in Jesus, the declaration of God's Infinite tenderness and the Call of loving invitation to whomsoever will sit down in the Marriage Supper of the Lamb.

Abstract reasoning is to absolute fact what apologetics are to the assertion of the life of Christ by the faithful Preacher.

The Scientist may tell us of the Cause of ebb and flow, and show us how to calculate times of high and low water. He may show us some of the mysteries of the buoyant water, and excite our wonder as he explains the influence and qualities of this or that Haloid Salt. But what are these compared to the wash of the rising tide? Before us is a great power—none the less so because we cannot define fully the reason of its appearance among the activities of nature. And, as with underset and breaker, with billow and sleepy flow, with spray clothed fringe and heaving green billowing bosom it rises before us, until sand and shingle,

weed-grown rock and shallow pool alike are covered, we accept it.

And even thus the poor, oft untrained mind of the common people, who were sure to stumble over the cunningly-worded creeds of the Sanhedrin, and who only in a very hazy way were able to follow the learned Rabbin in the Synagogue, no sooner heard the gracious utterances of Christ, than they straightway heard Him gladly. What they could not comprehend they yet laid hold upon as the little baby fingers will take the primrose from the hedgerow, whether the petals are all equally arranged or whether deformed. If the golden crown be there, and the glorious reflection of the Infinite Creator be undefaced, the details of arrangement are as nothing.

This human disposition, then, it is, which gives the preacher his power. Not the passion of his tones, not the clearly cut sentence, not the careful exegesis, but the living fire shining and glowing through the dull crust of the volcano, until the whole region becomes heated from its proximity. But be the cause what it may, it is manifest that wherever the truth is presented faithfully by the preacher, the truth most runs and has free course and is glorified.

In illustration of this we need only remember the efforts made by men, untutored, rough, often uncouth, to lift the masses of our fellow-men from slumdom and vice. Doctors, gaols, the police, schools have been labouring for many years with small appreciable results. But no sooner do our missionaries proclaim the loving-kindness of our God, than immediately the possessed become clothed in their right minds; vice hides her face, crime is accounted as disgraceful, and we are able to establish our churches in their midst.

At present we are compelled to use such means as are at our disposal, and through untrained Agents the poor receive Christ and are united in large numbers to the Church. But think, my brethren, what would be the result, if, instead of willing but unlettered men, whose noblest attempts are full of blunders and slips, our Church could send out into the back alleys and yards of our every populous parish, those who by special training, by vocation, by experience, were more able to carry on the work of the salvation of the helpless sinner.

Many densely populated centres are so poor that the incumbent can neither pay a single curate, nor can he by any kind of device persuade the few who have good incomes to guarantee any aid in this direction. There are in such districts such exceedingly bitter and loud cries for bread and clothing and other creature necessities, that we cannot see how the present state of affairs can be improved from within. At the same time the vicar has so many thousand souls which he is trained to believe he is responsible for to the Great Chief Shepherd. He has almost an infinite variety of

Organisations to work—as Coal Clubs, Soup Kitchens, District Visiting, and much more besides, in addition to the Celebrations and Services more distinctly appertaining to the Worship of the Lord in the Church itself. How can he prepare his Sermons so as to please and edify the parishioners, save at the expense of his other parochial duties? And yet he dare not neglect these nor those. One result is that he attempts more than he can possibly do even badly, and soon falls into ill-health and becomes utterly useless in his parish. You may think this is one extreme, and you are right. It is, however, the extreme nearest to which the centre of gravity lies!

I know there are officials receiving high incomes, and clergymen who hold well-paid sinecures; but if all the wealth of the richly endowed positions were thrown into the treasury, and a re-distribution took place upon equal terms, we should not be much nearer the goal. Most of our parishes would still be fearfully undermanned, and the fringe only of the matter would be affected. The time has now arrived when, if the Church is ever successfully to cope with the foes of a spiritual nature and life, she must do much more than she has ever thought necessary in the past in the way of providing pastoral oversight in the Home and Business Establishment, in the Recreation Hall, and the Place of Amusements. She must, so far as she can, have shepherds at hand wherever the mind is liable to be enslaved by plausible falseness, and whenever occasion arises which may be wrested by the enemy of souls to the ruin of them for whom Christ died.

And how, I ask, is this to be brought about under the present conditions of parish isolation? Is the burden of our message, the Glory of the Blessed Gospel, the Triumph of Christianity, not common to all the members of the Church Catholic? Some may be disposed to consider the presence of other philanthropic and religious agencies as excusing us from something of the neglect of the work of the Vineyard. And far be it from us to undervalue any civilising, any ennobling and elevating influence which makes for Universal Righteousness! But as Churchmen can we fairly, can we consistently leave the care of varying portions of our populace to any agency, regular or irregular, which does not adopt any organisation similar or truly substituting our parochial method.

In the work of bodies which (even when akin in doctrine and faith) are yet not only without the control of a central parochial direction, but are not exposed to the view of such powers, we cannot safely confide, to the extent of leaving in the hands of men, ever so well meaning, the teaching, the tending, the care of any portion of our parishes.

Agencies not of the Church may become supplementary, may even be auxiliary, but can never by us be allowed to act as substitutes for the Church. We honour the self-denying efforts of

workers outside the fold; but so long as we recite regularly our Belief in the Holy Catholic Church we should endeavour to provide for the whole vineyard labourers who are in fullest sympathy and in closest connection with that Church. And this we must do if we are to make good our claim to Mission the World for Christ.

II. But no doubt it has already occurred to some to ask what this all has to do with preaching? And is the answer far to seek? In the nineteenth Psalm we are told, "The heavens declare the glory of God," that "day unto day uttereth speech," and "there is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." And likewise the consistent goodness, the holy life, the faithful witness, the self-sacrificing ardour in work, the daily cross-bearing of the ministering priest or deacon may, nay often is, a more eloquent plea for the love of the heedless youth, of the frivolous maiden, of the sin-hardened man or woman, than all the sermons which have filled vaulted fanes with resonant praise to Jehovah.

When the priest is found going out into the highways and hedges, into the slums and alleys, into the distant cottier's home or up the hilly mountain slope in search of any and every of those who are called to furnish the Banqueting-Hall with guests, men take "knowledge of them that have been with Jesus," and multitudes of the denizens of vile haunts of iniquity have been won by the sympathy thus shown, who otherwise would never darken the Church door from their marriage until their death and burial.

Now, more than at any previous time it has become necessary that the preacher shall, while using his pulpit to the utmost of his ability, and according to the gift that is in him, go out seeking his people in the busy world of fact, of temptation, and of mad strife for mastery and money. There are wounds to heal, sores to salve, mental deformities to correct, protections to vouchsafe, loves to awaken, interest in life to fan to a flame, mad impetuous zeal for hastily acquired fortune, and restless impatience of the Divine Laws' restraints to chase from the life and character, and a thousand other offices to perform, by this oft-silent preacher, of blessed sympathy, and of trust in God. Do I magnify the Curate's Calling, or exaggerate as to the demand for such work? Nay! Rather have I but suggested a few of the services which must be rendered if our people are to look to the Church as the spring or channel through which the Refreshing Waters of Divine Inspiration are to flow.

A Call of Duty lays a fearful responsibility upon our shoulders. A Call of Love for our fellows who for want of just this Good News, this Gospel of Christ-like Sympathy of Man, are drifting into either a gross and unalterable indifferentism as to the future, a condition in which all the subjects may well be said to have "no hope in the world"; or they become snarling, carping, bitter opponents to any theory of belief in either Divine or Human

Nature—sceptics, not by nature but by neglect. They are not the casual weeds or brambles trespassing upon the well-kept garden plot; but are the weedy trailing overgrowth which the policy of idleness has even allowed to be sown with good seed, and has watered with the indiscriminating hand of the reckless and perfunctory gardener.

We, my brethren, are responsible largely for much of this Scepticism, especially among the half educated portions of our parishioners. They have fainted by the way, and have cried out for hunger; and we have fed them with the few loaves and fishes. But there has been no dividing, no distributing, no increasing hand, and only to very few hearts has joy come, and only a very small number comparatively have eagerly looked forward to the Celebrations of Divine Worship when the true worshipper is ever with wondrous comfort saying to his soul, "My feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem."

We would not ignore the loving labours of the District Visitor, and of the other Lay Agencies of the Church. But from these very Visitors and from the Godly Lay-Workers who know something of the real nature and extent of the Church Work of the future come the loudest and most continuous appeals for a stronger staff of Clergy. Brethren, they plead for preachers of the love and healing and feeding virtue of Christ. Shall it be in vain? How can they hear without a preacher; and how shall they believe in Him of Whom they have not heard; and how shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? And yet we are credibly informed by the Apostle himself, that "Whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved." How then? Will ye help us in the work of this satisfying of the craving of a sinning people who would be saved, yet know not The Way, not the Greatness of the Salvation, nor the Divineness and Love of Christ.

III. There can be no such preacher except he be sent. Many Incumbents are from yearly decreasing incomes using their every means to the best of their ability. By means of the exercise of a self-denying spirit, which they do not always ask or receive credit for in an age of suspicion, they are frequently found covering an extensive area, or leavening a dense and hostile population with seeds of future Church life, and by the claims of advancing years in his own body, and, last though not least, by a zeal for God's House, and for His beloved Church, is existing rather than living, and compelled almost to starve, by the miserable pittance, the Assistant Curate whom he cannot do without. Picture the heroism of the proud faith of such a one! Alas! there are too many to be found in England at the present day. See the undaunted men who side by side have hitherto stemmed the roaring tide of unbelief and decivilization, and that at the cost of nearly all which the world thinks makes life worth living. They are

but following the Example of Him who though rich yet for our sakes became poor, and of that other who "esteemed the reproach of Christ's greater riches than the treasures in Egypt."

But need they be reduced to such extremities. For extreme is the emergency without the slightest room for doubt. They are human, like all here, and are often tempted to consider their reasonable claims upon the Church. Condemned by the frequent drains of importunate affliction from their meagre income to feed upon the same books, the same often antiquated methods of thought, the same interpreters of the Word as of old; compelled to draw all their information as to current events and contemporary literature from the daily newspaper which is read by their parishioners, they are yet sensible that they ought to be in a position to lead their people, to do the pioneer work for those who have not the time and sometimes not the education to sift the chaff of plausible error from the heavy grains of wheat. In the face of novel methods of argument with which they are unfamiliar, and the tactics of which are beneath the act of a man of right feeling, they are Sunday after Sunday conscious that an eager expectant flock is waiting for them to give reason for the Faith that is in them!

The better Education of our younger people necessitates a more critical examination and a more discriminating distribution of the Word of Life. New and crying evils are raising their reeking swords in defiance of a feeble clergy. Everywhere enterprise unchecked becomes gambling; liberty is a cloak of licence; overcrowding—child of avarice—breeds all the vices told of by the Laureate in his more recent verses.

Circumstances require, and that imperatively, not only an additional staff of clergy, but what is even more important, that the men of God shall be well-equipped for the warfare. They must not only have a bare competence, but must be in a position to enrich their mental storehouse with the very best gems from the mine of Literature, and must also be enabled to direct the aspiring efforts of every boy and girl in their parishes. God calls them into the work, He sends them to the war. The King details their mission for them. But is there not a duty devolving upon His subjects?

Were we in deadly strife with an invader, should we be compelled to look to our own exertions or the power of our earthly ruler for the provision of ammunition and food? No! Every house in the land would have its little self-denial, its labour of love, its willing taxpayer. Every hamlet would supply lint, and reading and warm clothing for the hospital. Every bedside and every Church would warm the heart in presence of a prayer for those in peril on the field of carnage. Fighting for Country and Right, their countrymen and countrywomen, would make the cause actively their own. And is our cause for which we plead to-day less

urgent because eternal souls are being enslaved by the ruthless invader sin? Is the soul of less value than the house and land? It is not a question of attack, alas! for the Church has made that for years impossible by short-sighted lethargy. It is one of defence. Are we to abandon our posts and restrict our lines? For this is the question.

I ask you not to make good the lack of tithes. These are less than they have ever been. But that is only one of the difficulties of the Church. Did the tithe increase, my cry would still be a petition. Population becomes more dense, more godless, more self-engrossed than ever. Better weapons, better supplied veterans, and an ever increasing addition of God-fearing recruits are urgently needed to cope with this. Never was a worthier object than the Evangelising of England! Never was a more necessary step than that which the Church Pastoral Aid Society has taken to meet for the Church the wants of the people! Were it not for the Church Pastoral Aid Society St. Mary's Parish would probably be without its Assistant Curate. I stand here to-night the concrete expression of the Society's effort to help on in this Parish the Evangelisation of England, to tell its millions of the Love of Jesus for the souls of men. From the wounds of Jesus poured His Blood until His Life was drained away. What an exhibition of love for you and me and all men!

Let us then, each as God has put it in his power, contribute to this truly Christian effort. Let not one cast in of his surplus, of his abundance. But whether the very poor shall give his two prutahs like the widow of old, or whether gold and silver shall be surrendered, let it be what we *can* do, not what we are accustomed to do only. God loves a cheerful giver; and I know that many here will delight out of the fulness of their heart to help on the Lord's Work to the utmost of their ability.

THE ADVANTAGES TO THE LAITY OF BEING IN TOUCH WITH THE CLERGY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE WEBSTER, D.D.,
CHANCELLOR OF CORK, ETC.

SERMON PREACHED IN CORK CATHEDRAL,
APRIL 14TH, 1889.

"And He went into the Temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought."—
LUKE xix. 45.

ON last Sunday I endeavoured to show you some of the dangers connected with the popular demand upon the clergy that they should be "in touch" with the laity. Bear with me now whilst I say a few words about a totally different subject, and that is the enormous advantages the laity would enjoy if they were as anxious to be "in touch" with the clergy. The clergy, with all

their faults, have, I believe, been in every age just a little, and only a little, better than the laity. I am speaking now in a large and general way. No doubt there have been monsters of depravity among the clergy as there have been the purest and noblest of men amongst the laity. All history proves this, and I quite agree with Lord Macaulay in believing that a bad priest is the worst of men. This is true for many reasons. I am willing to grant to you laity any reasonable concession you demand on this point; but still, speaking soberly and truthfully, I believe I am justified in saying that in all ages the clergy as a whole have proved themselves to be a little better than the laity, and there are ten thousand reasons of a purely worldly character why this should be, and why it has been. I have no time now to discuss these reasons. Let this be granted; and now suppose the laity sought in all ages to be in touch with the clergy, it is evident this would have been a blessing both to the clergy and laity. The laity would have been seeking to be a little better than they were, and the clergy would have been seeking to be a little better than the laity, and so both would have moved upwards, seeking to be a little better from age to age, and both would have been gradually approaching nearer and nearer to the one Standard for all Who left us an example that we should walk in His steps. But what has been the fact? Just the reverse of this. In every voluntary Church in the world the laity have been trying, from the days of the Apostle Paul, to drag down the clergy. The laity in Corinth did their best to drag down St. Paul himself, and he, with all the vehemence and burning indignation of a true enthusiast in his Master's service, said it would have been better for him to die than that any man should make his glorying void. "I robbed other Churches," he says, "taking wages of them to do you service. And when I was present with you and wanted, I was chargeable to no man." The rich, vulgar, and liberal Corinthians, with all their ingratitude, could not drag down such a man as this. Let no man think he shows any humility by saying, "Oh, I don't go in for being an Apostle Paul." Such a speech indicates not humility, but unpardonable audacity, as if there were two roads to heaven—one road through all the trials well and faithfully endured by the true servants of Jesus, and the other a road for the creatures of selfishness and self-seeking cunning—the one a road for those who at breathing time sigh out, "If in this life only we have hope we are of all men most miserable"—the other a road for those who in their inmost souls say, "If in this life only we have hope, we shall have only a short life and a merry one, and if there be another world—well, at all events, the Gospel tells us that some way in the end we shall be as well off as even the Apostle Paul, and we may as well try and make the best of both worlds." Dear

brethren, if there be this second road to heaven, I for one, know nothing about it, and I see no reference made to it in the teachings of either our Blessed Lord or of His Apostles. "I am the way," the great King of Truth and Righteousness said, and all His followers—yes, all without any exception—must be able to say from the bottom of their souls, "To me to live is Christ"—that is, as I take it, "To me to live is to live the life of Christ"—that, at all events, must be their *intention*, that must be their standard.

To give up this abstract teaching, and to look for a moment at the concrete: You laity know, no matter what may be the wealth of any individual clergyman, he has entered a profession, the idea of which is not the making of money for himself. If the providence of God throws money in his way there is nothing in the clergyman's profession that hinders him from enjoying it, even if it were a living or a bishopric worth £20,000 a year. But still, *as a clergyman*, he might be a *spiritual* millionaire, and as successful in saving souls, as pleasing to God, as useful to the Church if he had to drag out his life here in the direst poverty. But would it be to the credit of any rich congregation if the man who was watching for their souls as one who would have to give an account, was watching with all the anxiety of an honourable man who at any cost felt he must keep out of debt? "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." Is it natural that the man who by his holy life and incessant labour is able to induce his congregation to give liberally to charitable institutions is yet to be in want himself? I know this happens sometimes from mere thoughtlessness on the part of the laity. I remember dining one time at the table of a nobleman who was as good a man as I knew. There was a very large and distinguished company present. After dinner I got into talk with a poor clergyman who was present. He told me he had a wife and children and a very small income. As he was praising our host, he said: "Now, I am always asked to grand dinners here, and that good and hospitable nobleman never seems to think of the fact that every time I dine here my mere car hire costs me 10s." This, brethren, I take to be a case of a thoughtlessness that is very common. But there is another and a far greater danger to which the laity are exposed. The idea of a merchant's life, for example, is by honest *business* rules to make an ample fortune. If he meddles with finance in the Church he is in great danger of bringing his *business* ideas among his brethren, and of treating everything connected with the giving of money to God as a business transaction. Of course, if such a layman is for merely worldly purposes, worldly ambition of any kind laying his unhallowed hands upon the Ark of God, there is but one doom before him, whether by his business plans and tricks he succeeds in sinking a parish for fifty years, or succeeds in keeping all the

financial concerns of the parish in the utmost prosperity. But I am not speaking of such a scoundrel as this. I am speaking of an honest, well-meaning, simple-hearted merchant, who carries into Church affairs a mere business idea. The laity, or the scoffing laity, may scoff as they please, and tell all kinds of nasty stories about money-grubbing Christians and pious attorneys and oily men of God, who always have a keen eye upon No. 1; but, scoff as they may, we clergy will never give up our sympathy with the well-known words of a well-known hymn:—

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were an offering far too small.

There is but the one motive, that our Master will bless, and with His blessing in all ages five loaves will feed five thousand people. Without His blessing it matters little how much money the Church receives; such money will never keep the Church alive. A rich Church without Christ's blessing may say: "I sit a queen and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death and mourning and famine, and she shall be utterly destroyed with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Let all money collected for the Church be collected from cheerful givers, who give because they are thankful, and because they love their Saviour. There is another subject different from this, but still it is a question that belongs to the laity. I hold that no layman should ever ask his clergyman to be worried with secular work at all. There is not, I believe, a clergyman in the world who would not be most thankful to the laity if each lady and gentleman, each man and woman, rich or poor, would do for Christ some secular work which could be done more effectually by a layman than by a clergyman. We clergy are not trained to secular work. As a rule we all hate it. We are out of our element in such work. We wish to give ourselves to the ministry of the Word, to teaching and preaching and praying, and in this way supporting all the spiritual machinery in our parishes. Some of us are simply overwhelmed with the amount of mere secular work that is put upon us. Some of us have to advance the money out of our own pockets to keep the spiritual machinery of our parishes in working order. My brethren, these things ought not so to be, but these things must continue as long as you laity are lukewarm in your service for Christ. We seek not yours but you. We might get yours, and you might notwithstanding this be living under the wrath of God. If we get you, if we win you for Christ, if we can melt your hearts by making you fix your eyes not merely upon the Cross, but upon the precious bleeding Body that once hung there for us men and for our salvation, then indeed will you be in touch not merely with us, but in touch with Him who bore all these sufferings for you, and then, with no sneer, no

scoffing at all, but with eyes full of tears and hearts full of sympathy, you will join in the refrain:—

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
That were an offering far too small.

There will not be the slightest fear of your making the house of God a place of merchandise and a den of thieves. All your mere business ideas will be confined to your places of business, and when you enter this building, or any other place of worship, you will feel that, rightly or wrongly, this building belongs not to you, but to Jesus of Nazareth. Whatever He did He has studded the whole civilised world with places of worship that cost hundreds of millions of money, and every one of these places of worship belongs to Him. For His sake, therefore, do not crucify Him afresh. Do not take advantage of His apparent absence to make these holy places places of merchandise. Imagine you see Him with a whip of small cords driving the traders out of His Father's house, pitching hither and thither their tables for money-changing, and refusing with blazing indignation to allow business ideas to have anything to do with the silent, humble offering that the poor widow made some forty-eight hours after the business idea was so summarily condemned.

THE ancient porch of Kimpton Church, Herts, has been reopened, after thorough restoration. It was built in the fifteenth century, but had been much defaced, and had fallen into a bad state of repair. Above the porch there is a large parish chamber, to which the access is obtained by a spiral stone staircase in a turret. The plaster and modern brickwork have been removed, and the old flint pointed; the labels to doors and windows, the string courses, and battlements have all been rebuilt in Welldon stone and flint work; the roof of the porch and the doorways have been repaired and renewed in oak. The vicar, the Rev. C. Stevens, preaching on 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, said that it was not generally known that weddings, churchings, and even christenings used to be commenced in the church porch, which also was the place where public meetings of the parishioners were held; as for the parish chamber, it had served in turn as a priest's residence, treasury, library, parochial school-room, and village lock-up. The Bishop of St. Alban's was prevented by weak health from preaching at the reopening. The work has been designed by Mr. J. O. Scott.

THE *Daily Telegraph* says:—"Some excitement has been aroused by the announcement that Mrs. Holland, wife of the Rev. F. J. Holland, one of the Canons of Canterbury Cathedral, has joined the Church of Rome. Mrs. Holland, who is a niece of the late Dean Lyall, Dr. Alford's predecessor, will be remembered by Londoners in connection with her husband's ministry of Quebec Chapel, Marylebone, which he held for several years."

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

Mr. C.B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation. **OBESITY IS CURED**, and willtion dietary. **gratis and post free**, on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1889.

"PIRATE MISSIONS."

WE believe that there is no system so disastrous to the real advance of the Christian Church as that of the innumerable private ventures going by the name of missions which abound in the poorer parts of our great cities. That there are some instances in which the motive of their founder is a pure one, and where the subscriptions are really applied to the proper object, we doubt not; but where this may be demonstrated to be true, there are, we think, twenty where this cannot be so easily shown. Nothing is easier in the present day than to start a mission, and, if "truth" is of no consequence, to obtain ample subscriptions—our hero has but to publish some heart-rending appeal, and from hundreds of benevolent persons money comes to the person named as Treasurer, who is generally at once Founder, Treasurer, Secretary, and Sole Trustee, in addition to the combined duties of Superintendent and Director of the mission, Missionary, Scripture Reader, and Bible-woman included. By means of a carefully planned contempt, resulting in some unpleasantness with the incumbent of the parish in which the in many cases imaginary mission is supposed to be located, and of all the other respectable Christian agencies in the neighbourhood he is able to hold them up to his supporters as paragons of crime, etc., and thus effectually to prevent any reference to them respecting the work of the mission, and by occasional visits in the locality, together with, say, an occasional open-air demonstration in which he delivers an address, the chief subject of which is that of "evil men"

who constitute the body of Christian ministers in the neighbourhood, he is able just to clear himself, if necessary, and in the eyes of the law, from an indictment for obtaining money under false pretences. Many are the evils which result from the numberless "Pirate Missions" as they are called, which are daily increasing both in number and in supporters. Many persons are led by means of the plausible statements issued by the promoters of these missions to subscribe largely, without making any inquiries as to the character of the person to whom their money is entrusted, or as to the real nature of the work carried on. Perhaps, as often happens, some more enterprising person takes the trouble to investigate the whole affair, and then naturally a great *exposé* occurs, which far from leading the former subscribers to transfer their subscriptions to some really good but less "flashy" cause, often leads them to register a vow that they will never again subscribe to any charitable object, "because they are all frauds." The recent letter of the Bishop of Bedford in reference to the poverty consequent upon the "Dock Strike" has done good service in explaining to the public how much care is necessary in responding to appeals. We would counsel our readers in no case to countenance appeals from those of whom they know nothing, unless the names of the promoters of the work appealed for are those of public men well known and respected; and we would, moreover, strongly advise Churchmen of all shades and opinions not to help to cripple our own Church agencies by assisting non-conforming bodies to maintain a strong position against the parochial agencies of the parish in which they are carrying on their hostile operations. In plain words, it is the duty of every Christian Churchman to do his utmost to try to stem the tremendous increase in pirate missions which are springing up all over the East-end of London.

SAVONAROLA—HIS LIFE AND TIMES.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D.,
RECTOR OF WARRENPOINT.

(Continued from page 142.)

BUT a task lay before Savonarola demanding a mightier faith and a firmer heart than he needed in his fencing with Lorenzo and Charles. Never had the Papacy fallen so low; never did such a flood of iniquity sweep into the Church as in those days of which we now speak. From Nicholas V. to Alexander VI. was a great and downward incline. Yet even in the pontificate of the former the Church was impure, and the lives of her priesthood most scandalous. But when a man whom all execrated was elected Pope; when the Church beheld in the chair of St. Peter a man of brutal lust and unbridled passions; when Cæsar Borgia, the son of the Vicar of God, filled Rome with blood and lust; when a monster of infamy sat in the seat of the great and wise men whose abilities and virtues made Rome the mother of

Churches, what wonder the stream of vice swelled into a torrent, and the monasteries and convents became houses of sin. Wickliffe calls Alexander VI. "the proud, worldly priest of Rome—the most cursed of clippers and purse carvers." Very soon Savonarola began to denounce the vices of the Church, to cry aloud for reformation, and to denounce the coming judgments of God. Very soon, too, Rome began to take the alarm. Alexander VI. commissioned a Dominican to answer the troublesome friar. He undertook to consider the matter, but when he inquired into the character and conduct of the man, he advised the Pope to make him a cardinal. But Savonarola did not care for the honour. He declared publicly that he wanted no "red hat" unless the hat came through martyrdom, "reddened with his own blood." "Verily," said Ludovico, "this is a true servant of God." Such a declaration was, however, nothing less than the proclamation of war to the knife with Alexander, and the end was easily predicted. If Savonarola could have relied on the support of the Florentines against Alexander, he might have defied him with some prospect of success, but his reforms, especially in the "burning of the vanities," had made him unpopular with a powerful section in Florence. In order to put down profligacy and indecency, Savonarola had devoted much attention to training the young people of his adherents to act as the police of a new kind of moral Inquisition. Under the command of Fra Domenico the lads and striplings, arrayed in white robes, wearing red crosses and olive wreaths, preceded by banners and images, marched in procession through the streets, visited every house, and asked that the *Anathema* should be given up to them. The *Anathema* consisted of pictures, brocades, tapestries, lutes, sculptures, dice and gaming-tables, music books and musical instruments, masks and masquerading dresses, copies of Ovid, Petrarca, Boccaccio, and other similar authors, mirrors, perfumes, and false hair, and all the varied vanities employed by the vain, the fashionable, and the vicious of a wealthy city in their pursuit of pleasure or pastime. These were all gathered by the Piagnoni into the great Piazza, and piled on shelves round a pyramid sixty feet high and eighty yards in circumference. Above the mass rose the symbolic figure of the old debauched Carnival, and the centre was of dry fuel, so that when the mass was lighted up to the chants of the Piagnoni and the sound of trumpets, the image of the impure old semi-Pagan Carnival should tumble into the fire and perish. Of course the young people were enthusiastic in the work of inquisition, but it is impossible to coerce people into virtue by such means. The Puritan spirit in England could enforce outward conformity, but it could not exclude hypocrisy, and when it had spent its force, the unnatural repression of the Commonwealth was followed as a natural consequence by the lawless immorality of the Restoration period. Doubtless Savonarola felt the dangers attending the course he had entered on, but we can understand that the proclamation of Jesus Christ as King of Florence was a reality to him, and we must not confound him with the Mahometan fanatic who burned down the Alexandrian Library because all that was good in it was contained in the Koran, and what was not was pernicious. At last the blow fell. Rome hurled the thunders of excommunication against Savonarola. He appealed from the Pope to the heavenly Pope, Christ, and denounced the power of Alexander as the "hellish power of Satan." After this

the end was clear. A Franciscan monk challenged Fra Domenico, the zealous champion of the Frate, to show by miracles that Savonarola was a teacher sent from God, and offered to test the matter by the ordeal of fire. Incautiously Fra Domenico accepted the challenge. Rome had triumphed. If Savonarola dared the ordeal he would perish. If not, his credit with the people was gone for ever. The Signory decreed that the ordeal should take place on April 7th. The sisters of Savonarola offered themselves for the fire. A beautiful child begged that he might be allowed to take the trial. The day arrived, and an immense pile eighty feet long, four feet thick, and six feet high, with a passage two feet wide running along its whole length, is erected, covered with oil, pitch, and gunpowder. Both parties arrive and prepare for the trial. But the Minorites never meant to run the risk. First they complain that Savonarola has enchanted the robe of Fra Domenico. He offers to lay it aside. Then they demand that he shall not carry the crucifix into the fire. There is much disputing, and many comings and goings to and fro, for Fra Domenico is a soldier of the Cross, and does not wish to give up the crucifix. And while the two parties argued and debated, the vast throng of people that filled the square and blocked up every window, and crowded every roof and every point of vantage in the neighbourhood, grew impatient and turbulent. They had been drawn together to see a miracle, or if not a miracle, at least to see the astonishing sight of men entering a fire for their opinions, and they were naturally anxious that nothing should prevent the show from taking place. At last Savonarola said: "Since they are not willing that you should enter with the crucifix, my brother, enter simply with the sacrament." This was, in the opinion of the Franciscans, a still worse profanation. "What if the Host should be burned?" Savonarola reminded them that even if this took place "the Accidents only would be burned, the Substance would remain." In vain was the argument. And now the heavens grew black with clouds and the rain came pouring down, drenching the pile and running down in streams off the platform. The delay had averted the ordeal by fire, but Savonarola had lost his influence for ever with the fickle, faithless populace, and the taunts of the crowd told him that the end was nigh at hand.

And twilight fell with blood, and with the shout
Of armed men and dust of battle rout.
Within those guarded portals it was calm,
And like a silver fountain rose the psalm.
And he once more in his high robes arrayed
Stood calm within that battered barricade.
And then the doors crashed in, and in the fray,
Whence he was borne unto his death away,
The friars fought like lions, as they stood,
Till the great crucifix was dashed with blood.
And Fra Silvestro by his side must go,
And the sweet soul of Fra Domenico,
On whom should fall the vengeful hate of Rome
Through dark dumb days of torture, till the foam
Fell from his parched grey lips, and his wild eyes
Were horrible with nameless agonies;
And each in the dark cell where he was thrown,
With God and with the torturers was alone.

On the following night—Palm Sunday—they stormed the convent of San Marco, and, burning down the doors with fire, rushed into the sacred edifice, despite a fierce resistance from some of the brethren. They seized Savonarola, Domenico, and Silvestro, who were thrown into prison. A court of sixteen judges having been appointed, the frate was

put on his trial. Many witnesses were produced against him, but no evidence appeared likely to injure his character. Then recourse was had to the torture. His hands were bound with chains behind his back, and fastened to a rope drawn over a beam of great height. Having been drawn up to a considerable distance from the ground, he was suddenly let drop, so that his feet nearly touched the floor. Thus his shoulders were dislocated, and his whole frame convulsed with acute agony. Lighted coals were applied to the soles of his feet, implements of torture were paraded before him, and the half-connected utterances wrung from him in his anguish were tortured into confessions of guilt.

But even this they found insufficient to afford a pretext for his death; and a notary of infamous life, Francesco Ceccone, was employed to garble and distort his utterances. Thus when Savonarola declared that he did all things "for glory," meaning the glory of God and of his country, Ceccone inserted "for human glory," thus making it appear that in his attacks on Alexander the friar sought to attract notice and magnify himself by crying down his superior, that he sought to be the greatest man in all the world. When word was brought to Rome of the transactions in Florence, Alexander declared Savonarola should die though he were John the Baptist. Two Papal commissioners were sent to Florence to superintend the execution, and the three friars were sentenced to be hanged and burned at Florence on the Vigil of the Ascension, 1498, one of the commissioners remarking, when an effort was made to save Fra Domenico: "A wretched friar more or less makes no difference, but let him die."

Of all the mockeries of justice which have been dignified by the name of trial, we know of none more scandalous or more iniquitous than the hideous sham which doomed Savonarola to the flames.

Yet doubtless even this was better than his previous suspense and torture. To a man constituted as Savonarola was, imprisonment and torture meant such intense agony as seldom falls to the human lot. His highly-wrought, sensitive nature shrank from suffering. Such an imagination suffers more in the dread expectation of impending torture than other men would in the hour of actual suffering. Who can paint the awful, maddening horror of the dungeon, the terrible dread of "the question," the racking doubts, the agonised suspense? And yet those horrible visions were all less horrible than the reality. How men with any remnant of human sympathy or of human feeling warming their hearts could carry out the cruel decrees of that religious intolerance which has made Rome an object of loathing to all who know the truth we cannot understand, but woe to the rulers and the guides of that system when God "maketh inquisition for blood"! Men like Savonarola sowed the good seed of His kingdom and watered it with their blood, but woe to that system which has made itself drunken with the blood of the saints of God! Well may we thank God that the lines have fallen to us in pleasant places, when we read the annals of those earlier days, when the pathway of the Christian was strewn with thorns, and he was called upon too often, like his Lord, to seal his testimony with his blood. Amongst the number of those who suffered death for the truth stands Savonarola.

On the same spot where the scaffold stood for the ordeal another was now erected, on which a pile of inflammable materials was raised, and at one end a

gallows with two arms like a cross. From those arms hung chains intended to support the bodies in the fire after the victims had been strangled. On the Ringhiera stood three tribunals—one for the Bishop of Vasona, by whom Savonarola was to be degraded, another for the Papal commissioners, the third for the Eight. The three friars were led first before the bishop, who was completely overcome by his feelings, and hardly able to discharge his awful duties. With deep emotion he uttered the words, "*Separo te ab ecclesiâ militante*"; adding, in his confusion, "*atque triumphante*." "I separate thee from the Church militant and triumphant." "From the Church militant," answered Savonarola, "not from the triumphant; that thou canst not do." Having been excommunicated, they were next led before the Papal commissioners, who, in the name of His Holiness Alexander VI., gave them plenary indulgence, remitted the pains of purgatory, and restored them to their first innocence. Then they were led before the Eight, who formally sentenced them to death. As they were led thence to execution the mob reviled and jeered them. Some wept and lamented.

Calmly, and with a fortitude unsurpassed in the annals of martyrdom, they went to their death, and conspicuous among them was Fra Domenico, serene, cheerful, and faithful even unto death to the master he loved so well, and whose influence over his mind seems never for a single moment to have lost its wondrous hold. Thus died Savonarola, the monk of Florence, a man of rare intellect, poetic imagination, stainless life, whose aims were most unselfish, and whom the world rewarded as she rewards all reformers, with hatred and obloquy and death. Around the scaffold on which he suffered raged a mob divided into those who were on his side and those who exulted in his overthrow, and the very executioner acted the buffoon over his corpse. For a long time after his death the strife of parties raged bitterly in Florence, and his adherents were ruthlessly persecuted, but as the years went by men began to form a more true estimate of his life and work, until the impartial verdict of history assigned him a foremost rank among the Reformers of the Church, honouring him as a pioneer of the Reformation, a martyr in the glorious cause of civil and religious liberty.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

SIR,—I did not till to-day receive the numbers of the PULPIT since the middle of July. I perceive that the unfortunate Church of Ireland is still the subject of attack and defence, both being sometimes "most tolerable and not to be endured."

Charges of heresy, etc., are bandied about it with much light-heartedness by "C. C. V.-G." and imaginary compacts between Broad Churchmen and Evangelicals, illustrated by references to Herod and Pontius Pilate, are brought forward with undecaying vigour. We have also the advantage of having authoritative statements of doctrine in "communicated" leading articles, which, I presume and hope, do not express the convictions of the Editor of the PULPIT with

rigorous accuracy. Permit me to ask for information on one or two points. In the last "communicated" leader of August 31st, I find the words "The preface to our Ordinal only states Scripture truth, that the apostles instituted these orders" (of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons), "of course by Divine guidance." May I ask where the Preface to the Ordinal states this?

In the same paragraph it is said: "Our Church and the Church Universal allows no orders but Episcopalian. Those coming to us with any other pretended orders are ordained over again." But, if such persons were not ordained before, how can they be ordained over again? And does not the author of the *communiqué* perceive that in the first of the two sentences I have just quoted he is simply begging the question? Who gave him the right to exclude from the Universal Church the whole body of Presbyterian Christians, at home and abroad?

This is the kind of reasoning, if it can be called reasoning at all, that brings disgrace on theology, and disgusts educated laymen of larger sympathies and fuller information. For really, it is a little too bad to ignore the difficulties presented by the earliest Church history to the exclusive Episcopalian view.

As regards the Athanasian Creed, your readers are still in the dark (for any information they have got through your pages) of the way in which the difficulties concerning it commenced.

At one of the earliest meetings of the Revision Committee, held in the month of October, 1871, and attended by all its fifty-two members except thirteen, seven bishops out of the twelve then on the bench being present, it was *unanimously* resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Dr. Salmon (now Provost of Trinity College, Dublin), "that the damnable clauses of the Creed of S. Athanasius be not used in public worship." The Lord Primate was in the chair, and concurred. But then came the difficulty, how this resolution was to be carried out? The clauses in question, *unanimously* disapproved of as far as their public recitation was concerned, were yet so interwoven with the proper substance of the Creed as to make their excision extremely difficult. Ultimately, therefore, the difficulty led to the entire suppression of the Creed in public worship, rather than to an alteration which seemed to deprive it of its majesty. But here was no question whatever of parties in the Church. There was no such coalition for selfish purposes between Broad Churchmen and Evangelicals as is now dreamed of. It was the general and very right feeling, that these clauses are objectionable, except with explanations that may satisfy the subtlety of theologians, but can never commend themselves to the simpler minds of laymen not trained in the casuistry of the schools. There was no compromise or betrayal of the sound doctrine regarding the Trinity and the Incarnation so admirably set forth in the great Creed, but simply an effort to discard a sanction of it going beyond Scripture warrant, and which proved distressful chiefly to those to whom such things as "everlasting damnation" are very awful realities.

As to Inspiration, on which your *communiqué* of August 31st has likewise something to say, let its author recollect that there are but two passages in Scripture in which the word occurs, one in the Book of Job, which does not apply to the question, and the other a passage which admits of a translation entirely depriving it of all definite bearing on it for dogmatic purposes.

Let me recommend to the writer of your *com-*

munique's a little more modesty, and a less firm conviction of his own infallibility.

I am pleased to observe that the question of the success or failure of Christ's atoning work has evoked from "J. B." an appeal to that ripened Christian feeling which theologians of the Augustinian school seem to have entirely lost.

C. P. M.

September 13th, 1889.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I cannot be justly charged with want of courtesy if I read Mr. Murphy's letters as he writes them; and I have no right to attribute to "carelessness" anything I find in them.

Carelessness in thinking or writing on the subject under discussion cannot be at all excused. Besides, on that plea a person might back out of anything. Yet this is his position in his letter to the PULPIT of 14th inst. He now admits that "all Israel" is the correct reading in Rom. xi. 26, but says that in writing "all men" he did not alter the sense? This is certainly a new departure in Philology. But it won't help him, as will be seen immediately. "All Israel will be saved" *when* the "fulness of the Gentiles be come in," by the taking away of the blindness of their unbelief; ver. 25. Whatever that "fulness" may particularly mean, it refers to a fact taking place in this world, and, consequently, the salvation spoken of cannot be their final restoration in the world to come. And the salvation which they partake of is their being "grafted into the body of Christ's Church." This is evident from ver. 23, which says, "And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again."

But *who* are the "all Israel"? Certainly, those who will be alive at the "fulness of the Gentiles," when this salvation takes place; and this "all Israel" will be only a small part of the all Israel who shall have ever lived. This text does therefore in no way help him to the belief that all men will be finally saved.

His quotation that there is neither Jew nor Gentile in Christ means that no exclusive privileges are enjoyed by either class in the Church of God now. Never was the admission of defeat and failure more explicit than when he acknowledges the "impossibility of demonstrating" his doctrine; and I ask any person blest with common sense if that does not mean that he cannot find that doctrine in the Bible?

I must correct him again in his manner of quoting Scripture when he writes that "all enemies shall be abolished." "Abolished" is not the word: When he shall have put "all enemies *under his feet*," is the correct quotation. Perhaps he may reply that in altering the words, he did not alter the sense; and that it was an act of "carelessness" on his part which my "mere courtesy" should have led me to excuse! I am afraid there will be a large demand on my courtesy before this letter is finished.

In a former letter he said that Christ would do a certain work "not by mere omnipotence"; I then asked how would He do it, if not by his omnipotence? Because it is grossly absurd to represent God as doing a thing, and yet not doing it by His omnipotence. And to show the absurdity of it I went on to remark that the words "mere omnipotence" implied that there was something *better* than omni-

potence ; and to show the absurdity of it still more, I asked what *could* be better than the omnipotence of Him "who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." (Ephes. i. 11.) He now calls this text of Scripture "Mohammedan theology"! Perhaps this was only another act of "carelessness," which my "candour" and "courtesy" should have prevented me from drawing attention to?

I must once more correct his manner of quoting Scripture. It is not said that Christ took upon Him the form of a "bond-servant," but rather the form of a "servant." But he merely alters the words and not the sense! Was it "carelessness" again? It is not true to say that Christ "laid aside His omnipotence" when He "took upon Him the form of a servant." He did not and could not, consistently with His Deity, lay it aside. The text in Phil. ii. 6, 7, settles this: "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but took upon Him (as God, without laying aside any of His attributes) the form of a servant." I do not know whether Mr. Murphy will acknowledge the authority of the Articles of our Church or not, but the second says that "the *very* and eternal God took man's nature"; and, as he acknowledges in his letter to the PULPIT of the 24th August, that the Athanasian Creed "ought thoroughly to be received and believed," he will have no hesitation in admitting that the "right faith is that our Lord Jesus Christ, although He be God and Man, yet He is not two but one Christ. One, not by *conversion* of the Godhead into flesh, but by *taking of the manhood into God*."

And with regard to the love of Christ, it may interest him to know that on one occasion "He looked round about upon them with *anger*" (Mark iii. 5); and that certain people are spoken of in Rev. vi. 16, as hiding themselves from the "*wrath of the Lamb*."

But it is unscriptural and irrational to speak of Christ laying aside any of His attributes, as if they were something different from Himself, or as if He could lay them aside and still be God. When we speak of the attributes of God we use a mode of speech adopted by theologians to bring the nature of the Deity within the range of our conception, and to point out what He is in Himself.

Thus, when we speak of His omnipotence we mean that He is an all-powerful Being; and if we bear in mind that He is a Spirit, it will help us to see how impossible the conception becomes of supposing that Spirit to exist without any power at all, and at the same time to be omnipotent! Equally unscriptural is it to speak of one attribute being *better* than another, because that would imply that He is better in one part of His nature than in another, whereas all his attributes are infinitely perfect. In those attributes "none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another, but the whole are co-eternal together, and co-equal."

His assertion that "holiness does not consist in power" is also greatly at variance with Scripture.

"Tarry in Jerusalem till ye be endued with *power* from on high." "God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of *power*, and of love, and of a sound mind"; "strengthened with *might* by His Spirit in the inner man"; "that the *power* of Christ may rest on me." And the Prayer Book says: "Grant that he may have *power* and *strength* to have *victory*, and to *triumph* against the devil, the world, and the flesh."

R. DONALDSON.

DIVINE INFLUENCES TRANSFORMING HUMAN CHARACTER.

SIR,—I wish to offer some remarks on the references to myself, in Mr. Sandland's letter, which appears under this date.

He again attributes to me statements that I never made. I do not suppose he does so intentionally; but I submit, that when he writes about statements of other people, he ought to take the trouble to see what they really are.

He accurately quotes my declaration, "that one of the great objects which the Scheme of Redemption accomplishes is the correction of defective and perverted faculties." He then goes on to say, "This is true." But this I take it, was not his original position, the position which I showed to be wrong. If I mistake not, his contention was "that the correction . . . was absolute, irrespective either of God's attributes, or of man's will." Such a position is utterly untenable. My original position was simply this, that ample means are provided in the Scheme of Redemption for the correction of defective and perverted faculties. That may be found on reference to the PULPIT of 3rd August. He has entirely changed the sense of what I said; and yet his inverted commas seem to imply a quotation of my very words.

If God worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure, does not that imply a correction of perverse wills and faulty feelings? How do we acquire a new birth and a love of holiness except through Divine influences? "Not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. . . . We are His workmanship." A perverse will and perverse ideas must be altered before a man perceives the need and feels inclined to ask for spiritual blessings from God.

I did not mean to say that one set of texts contradicts another set of texts, although I see I did not express my meaning clearly. What I meant was, that some texts appear to be the opposite of others, but may be harmonised by applying the grand regulative texts such as "God is love Our Father Your Father which is in heaven." By that process, we who entertain the brighter hopes arrive at the conclusion that hell "is not endless but the way to righteousness," quoting the words of the Bishop of Argyll. We do not understand the Bible to declare that it is the purpose of God to abandon any of the intelligent and sensitive beings, to whom He has given life, and to leave them in a state of endless, irremediable sin and misery.

Mr. Sandlands asks me to mention some texts opposite to a belief that hell is endless. I have a long list, over thirty, but will simply bring forward the following: Col. i 16-20, Ephes. i 9-10, John xii. 32.

Mr. Sandlands now says, My original words implied that we need no dogma, and that I referred to the opinions of those men who regard the holding of dogma as destructive of character. I do not see that he is justified in saying so. In my letter, which appeared on 3rd August, I gave my own opinion, founded on what Mr. Gladstone said in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1888, "that the Augustinian theology put forth dogmas which inspire aversion among persons of intelligence and culture, living in our age, even when they are good and devoted men." Neither my words, nor a legitimate inference from them, indicate that we do not want dogma; nor is there the slightest reference to the opinion of any one that

dogma is destructive of character. Is that a fair way of handling language?

Mr. Sandlands again refers to death-beds: I have read of infidels who manifested terror and agony when dying, of others who naturally said they found the prospect before them dark and uncertain, and of others who seemed to be calm and serene. It is to be recollected that a man may believe in God, and trust in Him, even though he may not perceive adequate evidence that the Bible contains a revelation from God. We have several eminent men, apparently in that condition, and I know of one estimable lady. I have often heard of those, believed to be true Christians, having very unhappy death-beds. This I think is partly owing to the gloomy views which have been inculcated respecting God's character and purposes, as also sometimes to the consciousness of having led inconsistent lives. In many cases, likewise, it may justly be attributed to the condition of the cerebral organs, through disease.

J. B.

Canonbury, 21st September, 1889.

"FIDELITY IN PERIL."

SIR,—In the very interesting sermon published by Mr. Cooke in the PULPIT of 14th inst., there are some serious historical inaccuracies, due, no doubt, to oversight. It is a manifest anachronism to speak of "a letter of the Church of Smyrna written by Ignatius in A.D. 167," since Ignatius suffered martyrdom in the reign of Trajan, about 110 A.D. The letter referred to, and quoted, is the Letter of the Smyrneans to the Church of Philomelium, known as the martyrdom of Polycarp, written (according to Bishop Lightfoot) soon after 156 A.D. The second quotation, beginning, "if the life of the Lord was lived only in appearance, etc.," is not taken from this letter at all (as the sermon seems to imply), but from the epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrneans fifty years before. The importance of the Ignatian epistles, arising from their early date and their bearing on important controversies, is my excuse for drawing attention to an error which deprives them of half a century of antiquity.

THOS. C. ABBOTT.

Schull, Co. Cork, September 16th.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beal, Rev. S. Gilbert, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Strathmore and Mission-Priest at Glamis; Rector of Romal-kirk, Darlington.

Budds, Rev. John B., M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to Chatham Dockyard.
Churchill, Rev. E. Bailey, Curate-in-Charge of Ruardean, Gloucestershire.
Coote, Rev. Herbert Chidley, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Poole, Dorset.
Duke, Rev. Edward St. Arnaud, M.A., Vicar of St. Dunstan's, Earle-road, Edge Hill; Surrogate for the Diocese of Liverpool.
Fletcher, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate of Barkway, Royston, Cambridgeshire; Rector of Swalecliffe, near Whitstable.
Fox, Rev. G., Vicar of Oldbury-on-Severn; Vicar of St. Luke's, Gloucester.
Harris, Rev. S. F., M.A., B.C.L., Vicar of St. Michael-and-all-Angels', Blackburn; Vicar of St. Leonard's, Walton-le-Dale.
Hartley, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Little Dunmow, Essex.
Heard, Rev. W., Rector of St. John's and Rural Dean of Essequibo; Canon of St. George, in the Cathedral of St. George.
Hill, Rev. Charles Rowland Haydock, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, West Fordington, Dorset.
Hoets, Rev. Maurice Erskine, M.A., Chaplain of Bath College.
Irving, Rev. T. H., Second Curate of Kendal; Vicar of Lindale-in-Cartmel.
Jenkins, Rev. J., Curate-in-Charge of Caerfallwch; Rector of Hirnant, near Llanfyllin.
Lloyd, Rev. Edward Lewis, B.A., Rector of Winterborne Gunner, Wilts.
M'Neile, Rev. Hector, M.A., late Manchester Diocesan School Inspector; Clerical Superintendent of the Liverpool Church of England Scripture Readers' Society.
Marsden, Rev. William Green, B.A., Vicar of Cholesbury, Bucks.
Morton, Rev. T. F., M.A., Chaplain to Portsmouth Dockyard.
Ord, Rev. Christopher Joseph, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Chatham.
Parsons, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of Brompton Ralph, Somersetshire.
Rawlinson, Rev. Charles Raymond, Vicar of Pawlett, Bridgewater.
Redpath, Rev. Henry A., M.A., Rector of Holwell, Dorset; Vicar of Sparsholt-with-Kingstone Lisle, Berks.
Shaw, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Arlington.
Sisson, Rev. M. J., Chaplain of the Spalding Workhouse; Chaplain of H.M. Prison, Cambridge.
Soady, Rev. J. S., B.A., Curate of St. Andrew's, Sharrow, Sheffield, Vicar of North Newbald, Brough, Yorkshire.
Stokes, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Selly Hill; Vicar of Middlezoy, Somerset.
Talbot, Rev. Percival Barnay, B.A., Curate of Farrington Gurney, near Bristol; Vicar of Christ Church, Downside, Bath.
Tanqueray, Rev. Edward Bertram, B.A., Curate of St. Augustine's, Wisbech; Vicar of St. Thomas's, Pond's Bridge, Huntingdon.
Townshend, Rev. H. T. E., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Vaughan, Rev. E. J., M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Cambridge*.
Waggett, Rev. Philip Napier, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Charterhouse Mission, in the parish of Holy Trinity, Southwark.
Wall, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Hill Top; Vicar of Drayton Bassett, near Tamworth.
Walters, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Pershore and Honorary Canon of Worcester; Archdeacon of Worcester.
Warlow, Rev. E. J., Chaplain of Bengal (Lahore).
Wigan, Rev. Francis William, M.A., Rector of Luddesdown, Kent.
Williams, Rev. George Henry, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Williamson, Rev. George Chaloner, Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Lea, Ven. Archdeacon, at Orchardlea, Droitwich, on the 24th ult., aged 69.
Nichols, Rev. William Luke, M.A., F.S.A., formerly Vicar of Buckland Monachorum, and afterwards Minister of St. James's and Trinity Churches, Bath, at Woodlands House, near Bridgewater, on the 25th ult., aged 87.



The Church of England Pulpit.

CARDIFF CHURCH CONGRESS.

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

DELIVERED BY THE RIGHT REV. THE BISHOP OF
LLANDAFF, ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1ST, 1889.

THE first duty which I have to discharge this afternoon is to me a very pleasant one. It is on behalf of the town of Cardiff, the diocese of Llandaff, and, I feel sure, I may add of the whole Church in Wales, to offer to your Grace and the prelates, clergy, and laity who have come from outside the borders of the principality to honour us with your presence on this occasion a very warm and cordial welcome.

The Church in this portion of your Grace's province appreciates the kindness which has prompted you to come amongst us at this time all the more, because we are fully persuaded that one motive by which you have been actuated is a desire to give us a proof of your sympathy under the peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, and a pledge to assure us that we shall not look in vain to you for more substantial help, if, in order to enable us to resist the assaults of our foes, that help should ever be required.

The pleasure and gratification which your visit has afforded us, great as it is, will have been still further enhanced, if we might venture to cherish the hope, as I trust we may, that it will not only have left in your minds pleasant memories, but also have served to convince you that Cardiff is not an insignificant, out-of-the-way town, where all the women wear tall hats, and the English traveller is not secure of the necessities of life without the aid of an interpreter, but one which is easily accessible from all parts of England, and, in respect of the extent of its population and its political and commercial importance, is not unworthy to have claimed the honour which it now enjoys, of having the Church Congress for its guest; above all, if it shall have left you satisfied that the Church in Wales of to-day—the lineal descendant of the ancient British Church—is not so far wanting in vitality and earnestness in doing God's work as to be undeserving of the affection, the sympathy, and the support of the Church in England.

Not less pleasant than the first is the second duty which it falls to me to discharge to-day—that of conveying to your Grace my own personal

thanks for having consented, at my request, notwithstanding the many weighty and important duties which make such incessant demands upon your time and strength, not only to favour us with your presence, but also to preach one of the sermons with which the proceedings at this Congress have commenced. I can assure your Grace that the favour which you have conferred by this act of kindness upon the Church in this portion of your province is not unappreciated by those to whom it has been granted, and that the weighty and stirring words to which we have listened this morning will go far to encourage us in the midst of our difficulties, and to quicken our zeal in doing our appointed work.

To the Lord Bishops of Derry and Lichfield, who with a like readiness have encouraged and instructed us with their sermons at St. Mary's and St. Andrew's, I desire also to express my heartfelt thanks.

I hope that on this the occasion of the first visit of the Church Congress to Cardiff it will not be altogether out of place if I say a few words concerning the guest whom it is our honour and privilege during the present week to entertain. In speaking of the Church Congress, I am well aware that I shall be speaking upon a subject which has been dwelt upon by many former presidents, far more able and learned than myself, from whom we have learnt what a Church Congress is, and what it is not, the peculiar place which it occupies amongst other gatherings of Churchmen which have come into existence in recent times, and also the class of subjects which it may properly and profitably discuss. It is not my intention to travel over any of this well-trodden ground. My endeavour will rather be to point out the importance of the place which the Church Congress seems to me to occupy in the history of that great Church revival, unprecedented in respect of the rapidity of its growth and development, by which the last half-century has been distinguished, and to show to how large an extent it has, under God's blessing, contributed to promote and accelerate its progress. It is now just twenty-nine years since the first Church Congress met. For at least twenty years before that date the condition of the Church was such as to give great cause for uneasiness and alarm to all her loyal sons. The controversies which grew out of what is known as the Oxford or Tractarian movement had here gradually been sowing the seeds of dissension amongst the ranks of the clergy, by the majority of whom it was at first regarded as dangerous and reactionary, and who therefore deemed it to be their duty to do all in their power to check its progress. Day by day the controversy increased in bitterness. Hard words on one side produced irritation on the other, and as the new movement grew in force and influence, as new adherents were daily being gathered into the ranks of its supporters, so in like

proportion did the hostility of its opponents increase in intensity, until at length a disastrous rupture seemed imminent. Combined action for their common work was no longer possible amongst the great majority of the clergy, and with want of union came want of strength, and God's work languished. The scene which the Church presented at that time filled the hearts of good men on both sides with sorrow, whilst they who longed for the Church's downfall looked on with joy and satisfaction. It was at this critical juncture that the idea was first conceived of inviting Churchmen of all schools of thought, clergy as well as laity, to meet together on a common platform, for the purpose of discussing practical questions calculated to increase the Church's efficiency and to enable her the better to carry on her great work of gathering into her fold the vast multitudes who at home and abroad were lying in the depths of ignorance and sin, and of building up in faith and holiness those who had already been gathered into her communion. At first the proposal failed to meet with universal approval. There were not a few loyal Churchmen who feared that the bringing together of numbers of earnest men, fresh from the heat of controversy, would only result in widening the existing breach and precipitating a rupture, already apparently only too imminent, and that, therefore, sad as the present might be, it would be better to endure it than risk the bringing about of a future even more disastrous. And then to add to the discouragement of the promoters of the new movement, the daily press, so frequently inspired with the gift of foreseeing events which never come to pass, gave solemn warning that the occurrence of the evils which many good men feared was certain and inevitable. But, notwithstanding the apprehensions of over-timid friends, and the gloomy forebodings of nineteenth-century prophets, the faith of the promoters of the new movement remained unshaken and their ardour and enthusiasm unabated. The experiment was made, and the Church Congress was born, the rival schools met face to face, and then lifted up their voices with one accord in prayer—"That it might please God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace, to give them grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers they were in by their unhappy divisions, and to take away all hatred and prejudice and whatsoever else might hinder them from godly union and concord, so that they might be all of one heart and one mind, united together in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and might with one mind and one mouth glorify Him."

That prayer was heard and answered. The waves of angry controversy, by which the Church had long been tossed and shaken, began to subside, moderate men of all schools were gradually drawn more closely together by the bonds of mutual respect and esteem, leaving outside an

ever-narrowing fringe of irreconcilables, whom, for want of a more appropriate title, I may perhaps be permitted to describe as "the peculiar people." Amongst the rest earnestness in strife and debate began in no long time to give place to earnestness in work, and the Church Congress, which it was feared by some and hoped by others would become the arena in which angry disputants would be seen striving for mastery, became one of the Church's busiest workshops, in which through the thorough ventilation of the defects in her system, and the suggestion of various possible means for their removal, public opinion was gradually ripened and prepared for the adoption of measures for strengthening her machinery, reforming her abuses, and creating fresh organisations specially adapted to the furtherance of the work for whose development they had been set on foot.

The child born under these favourable auspices, whose earlier years gave promise of a vigorous and useful manhood, grew rapidly into maturity, and in the course of time became the parent of a promising and healthy offspring. The Congress of the Church of the nation gave birth to the conference of the diocese, in which, in these small areas, the discussion of questions of local importance was supplemented by the consideration of others of more general interest. The institution of these smaller deliberative assemblies of Churchmen called in no long time for a new departure, and the importance of gathering up and focussing their several decisions for the information of the Church at large rendered necessary the establishment of a Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, to be composed of lay and clerical delegates chosen from amongst the members of the conferences of the several dioceses, to which has been more recently added the institution of a House of Laymen for the province of Canterbury, who are to sit simultaneously with the two Houses of Convocation, not only for the purpose of assisting them with their counsel and advice upon any questions upon which such counsel may be required, but also to deliberate upon such matters affecting the interests of the Church as properly belong to the province of laymen to discuss. Thus step by step has the Church's system of deliberative councils been built up, and now only awaits the formation of a House of Laymen for the Northern Province to render it well-nigh, if not absolutely, complete.

But the development of her system of deliberate councils is not confined to the Church at home. Their great value in the solution of difficulties, the removal of misunderstandings, and the uniting together more closely for their common work Churchmen of all classes and schools of thought has not been unobserved by the Church abroad, and, so far as I am aware, there is not, at the present moment, a single Colonial diocese in which such a council does not form part of its regular organisation. Nor does the progress of their

development end here. As the Churches of the Anglican communion grew in number, occupied a wider territory, and were called upon to deal with fresh difficulties consequent upon their rapid extension and contact with new races, questions of great importance affecting the welfare of the whole Church began to call for settlement, and in the course of time a widespread feeling was found to prevail amongst the Churches in various parts of the world that the assembling of representatives of all the Churches of the Anglican communion for mutual conference upon the various questions by which she was agitated would, under the blessing of Almighty God, prove the most effectual means of bringing about their satisfactory settlement. After anxious consideration by the then Primate, Archbishop Longley, of the whole question, and consultation with his Episcopal brethren at home and abroad, the first conference of the Bishops of the whole Anglican communion assembled at Lambeth in 1867; and although that meeting was held under circumstances of exceptional difficulty its success was such as to satisfy the majority of those who took part in it that the experiment was a wise one, and to enable the revered successor of Archbishop Longley, in obedience to the wish of a very large majority of his brethren at home and abroad, to feel justified in repeating it at the close of the succeeding decennial period. The results of the second Lambeth Conference are thus described in the farewell words of the late Archbishop, addressed to the assembled prelates after the final service in St. Paul's Cathedral. "I feel confident," said his Grace, "that the effect of our gathering will be that the Church at home and abroad will be strengthened by the mutual counsel which we have taken together." During the ten years which have since elapsed the confident hopes which were then expressed, have, under God's blessing, been abundantly realised, and their fulfilment doubtless served greatly to encourage your Grace to invite in the course of last year the Bishops of all Churches in communion with our own to assemble at Lambeth for a third Pan-Anglican Conference. The proceedings of that conference are doubtless still fresh in all our memories. It will be sufficient to say of them that they resulted in resolutions of such wisdom and importance as to secure the universal approval of thoughtful men of all colours and shades of opinion, and to be received by the Churches for whose benefit they were published with feelings of the deepest thankfulness to Almighty God, under the guidance of Whose Holy Spirit we believe them to have been framed.

In the presence of such an audience as it is now my privilege to address it is needless for me to enumerate the many evidences which are to be found, as well in the Church abroad as at home, of the growth and development of an amount of

spiritual life and activity which has never been exceeded, if it has ever been equalled, in any previous period of her history, and if, as I have endeavoured to show, the Church Congress has been mainly instrumental in terminating the isolation which had so long prevailed amongst the ranks of the clergy, and in proving that the assembling of Churchmen of different schools of thought for mutual counsel and combined action for the promotion of their common work was no longer impossible; then I claim for it a foremost place amongst the means which it has pleased God to use for bringing about that marvellous change in the condition of the Church which is daily deepening the love and affection of all her loyal sons, and winning for her in constantly increasing measure the admiration and respect of thousands and tens of thousands of the more serious and thoughtful of our Nonconformist brethren.

But the Church Congress did not come into existence without the help of two loving parents—of whom one has long since been called to rest, the other is happily still amongst us—by whose tender and watchful care the child was supported under the cold blasts of ridicule and contempt which assailed it in the feeble years of its infancy, by whom its footsteps were guided during the critical days of its youth, and who now looks with just and laudable pride upon the vigour and usefulness of its manhood. To-day we have the honour and privilege of entertaining both parent and child. To the child we have already accorded a warm and hearty welcome, and I am much mistaken if the name of the parent is not received by this vast assembly of loyal Churchmen and Churchwomen with such an amount of enthusiasm as to convince him that his past earnest labours are not unappreciated, and that there are few, if any, of the distinguished men who occupy a place on this platform to-day for whom they entertain a more sincere regard or to whom they feel that they owe a deeper debt of gratitude than to the Ven. Archdeacon Emery.

It will be seen by a reference to the list of subjects set down for discussion during the present week that the aim of our committee has been to select such as are of a practical rather than of a speculative character. If the result of their labours shall have been to render the present Congress a little less exciting than some of its immediate predecessors, it is hoped that it will not on that account be found less useful, or less acceptable, to thoughtful, sober-minded Church people, who are probably less anxious that the Church Congress should create a sensation than that it should continue from year to year quietly carrying out the objects for the promotion of which it was first called into existence, and which are thus described in the statement prefixed to the rules by which its proceedings are to be governed. "The object of the Church Congress is to bring together members

of the Church of England, and of Churches in communion with her, for free deliberation and further exchange of opinion and experience on subjects which affect the practical efficiency of the Church, and the means of defence and extension, and also for the encouragement of a general interest in these and kindred subjects amongst the clergy and laity in different parts of the country."

Not less difficult than the task of selecting suitable subjects for discussion has been that of securing the services of able and acceptable readers and speakers to introduce them. In the selection of these the committee have not been unmindful of the existence within the Church of various schools of thought, or of the duty which belonged to them of securing for each of these schools as far as possible a fair representation on this platform. If it should appear to any present that their labours in this direction have not been attended with complete success, I can assure them that it has not been due to any want of effort on their part to ensure it.

In order to extend as far as possible throughout the surrounding neighbourhood the beneficial influence of the Church Congress, arrangements have been made, through the kindness of some of our visitors, for the holding of working men's meetings at some of the more important centres of population in the diocese, at which addresses on suitable subjects will be delivered.

As it is probable that all who are present have had opportunities of examining the official programme, it will not be necessary for me to make particular reference to each of the subjects which it contains. There is one, however, upon which I hope I shall be pardoned if I venture to make a very few observations. It is one which could hardly fail to find a place in the programme of a Church Congress held where we are now assembled, even if it did not occupy as much, if not more, of the attention of Churchmen in every diocese in England than almost any other at the present time. I need hardly say that I allude to the Church in Wales. The subject is one which was very ably dealt with at last year's Congress, yet not so exhaustively, in my opinion, as to have left nothing that is interesting or instructive to be said concerning it. I venture to express the hope that when it is discussed in this hall to-morrow morning the number of our English friends who will be present may be somewhat less insignificant than that which attended the discussion of the same subject at Manchester last year, because I am satisfied that there are few, if any, subjects upon which English people generally are more in need of correct information than concerning the circumstances, the work, and the present condition of the Church in Wales. Not many years ago the following observations were made, in my hearing, by one well acquainted with the condition of the Church in Wales, and the state of English opinion concerning it:—

"English people," said the speaker, "are under the impression that there is *no* Church in Wales, that its only representatives are the clergy, and a few country squires and their families; but that, with these exceptions, the Welsh are a nation of Nonconformists; and this opinion," he added, "is not confined to the uneducated classes. I have conversed with statesmen, who have regarded such a description as scarcely, if at all, exaggerated." Nor is the ignorance which then prevailed difficult of explanation when we bear in mind, on the one hand, the diligence, the unscrupulousness, and I will venture to add the audacity with which Liberationist agitators through the Press, and every other available means, have been inculcating the grossest false statements concerning her, and, on the other, the almost total neglect on the part of the Church, until comparatively recent times, to expose them by the publication of the truth. I am willing to believe that through the more energetic efforts of the Church in this direction during the last few years the darkness which then prevailed has been rendered somewhat less dense, but when in the course of the present year Members of Parliament representing Welsh constituencies can rise in the House of Commons and make, amidst the approving cheers of a considerable section of the members of that House, such statements as I will presently quote, the importance of using every effort to promote the wider circulation of accurate information upon this important subject on the other side of Offa's Dyke can hardly be exaggerated.

The first of the statements to which I have referred runs as follows:—

"The Church of England was established by the State to promote religious instruction and religious ministrations for the people of the country, and it extended its operations to Wales as well as to England, and created a machinery for carrying out its operations."

The second statement comes from the lips of a member for a North Wales constituency, and, if I mistake not, one who held a place in a Government not now in office: "The Church in Wales in fighting Dissent does not preach practical Christianity." "In Wales it had come to this state of things—no Dissenter need apply." "Churchmen in Wales might be known by the number of servants which they kept and the time at which they dine." "The Church in Wales has done nothing for the Welsh working man, but to make him a miserable servant." A third honourable member, representing a constituency in this diocese, and speaking of a portion of the district which he represents, found it possible to make the following statement: "They had been told that churches and schools were increasing in the Rhondda Valleys. Well, one church was built by a nobleman—a landlord, who allowed the use of it to the Protestants on condition that

they gave it up when there were sufficient Catholics to fill it!"

Will it be believed that in these two valleys during the last six years eight new churches have been erected, providing accommodation for upwards of 3,000 worshippers at a cost of more than £22,000, and that two others are now in course of erection which will seat 1,200 persons, upon which the outlay will exceed £14,000?

It is difficult to believe that that can be a just and righteous cause, or one which is likely to prosper, which requires to be bolstered up by such libels and monstrous false statements as those which I have just quoted. At the same time I cannot but feel thankful that the Church Congress has been the means of bringing so many English Churchmen and Churchwomen amongst us who will be able to judge by personal observation how far they convey a true and accurate picture of the character and condition of the Church in Wales. I earnestly hope that our English friends will not be content to survey her work within this great town alone, where I do not think it is wholly unworthy of their notice, but that they will endeavour, if possible, to visit other large centres of population within the diocese, such as Aberdare, Dowlais, Mountain Ash, and the Rhondda Valleys, in order to see what she is doing. I shall be much surprised if the result of their visits will not be to prove to them conclusively that the adherents of the Church in Wales are not limited to those who keep servants, drive to church in a carriage and pair, and dine at the same hour at which the honourable member who thus described them probably partakes of his principal meal, but that there are to be found amongst them thousands of the hardy sons of toil, whose only income is that which they earn by the labour of their hands and the sweat of their brows, and that when they return to their homes they will be able to assure their friends that the Church in Wales of to-day, whatever may have been her shortcomings in times past, is fully alive to her responsibilities, and that although the difficulties with which she has had to contend have been well-nigh insurmountable—difficulties arising from the poverty of her endowments, sadly diminished from time to time by successive acts of spoliation—difficulties arising from the prevalence of two distinct languages, and the rapid congestion at numerous centres of vast populations, and not least from the long continuance of the rule of non-resident bishops, ignorant of the language, out of sympathy with the habits and feelings of the people, and only at rare intervals present within the borders of the dioceses over which they had been called to preside—although she has had to contend with these and many other difficulties which might be named, she has at this moment a larger number of members than any other religious body in Wales, a number which does not fall far, if at all, short of one-third of the aggregate population of the country,

and which is at the present time increasing with such marvellous rapidity as to enable us to cherish the confident hope that the day is not very far distant when the well-known prediction of a venerable patriarch of Welsh Methodism will be fulfilled, and "the bees will all have returned to the old hive again."

I much fear that I have already exceeded the limits of the time allotted to me for these opening observations, and as the subject set down for discussion this afternoon is a peculiarly interesting one, I feel that I shall best consult your wishes by at once bringing them to a close. I cannot do so without the expression of my cordial thanks for the patience with which you have listened to them, nor without an earnest prayer that it may please God to bless abundantly the work in which we are now about to engage, as well as all our other efforts for the promotion of His glory and the welfare of His Church.

THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL.

BY THE REV. J. A. CARR, LL.D., VICAR OF
WHITECHURCH, CO. DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH
AT MÜRREN, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 25TH, 1889.

"And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of His mouth."—ACTS xxii. 14.

THE conversion of St. Paul has been always regarded as a standing evidence for the truth of Christianity. Its importance from this point of view may account for the prominence it gets both in the Acts of the Apostles and also in the writings of the Apostle himself. The narrative—bearing on its face the impress of truth, and not to be accounted for on any reasonable grounds, saving those only which recognise its historical reality—was certainly the means of converting at least one prominent unbeliever in former days to the truth of the Gospel. Lord Lyttelton has declared that besides all the proofs of the Christian religion which may be drawn from the prophecies of the Old Testament, from the miracles of Christ, and from the evidences given of His resurrection by all the other Apostles, he thought the conversion and apostleship of St. Paul alone, duly considered, was of itself a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation.

Let us consider for a moment how the case stands. First of all we have the historical account of the event given to us in the ninth chapter of the Acts; then we have two separate accounts of it given by the Apostle himself before his judges. He was bound to explain how he came to be a Christian from being a bigoted Jew and an enemy of the new faith, and he has no other explanation to give

of the great change that came over him than that which we find repeated in the Acts and in his Epistles. In several of these Epistles addressed to the churches he founded, and of whose authenticity there never has been any reasonable doubt, St. Paul refers to the circumstances of his conversion. Thus, to the Galatians he writes, "I certify you brethren that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and wasted it . . . but when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the heathens, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." He writes to the Philippians, "If any other man thinketh he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the Church touching; the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things and do count them but dung that I may win Christ." In his first Epistle to Timothy he writes, "I thank Christ Jesus, my Lord, who hath enabled me for that He counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry, who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious. But I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." Elsewhere he calls himself "an apostle by the will of God, by the commandment of God our Saviour and our Lord Jesus Christ, an apostle not of man, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised Him from the dead." He tells the Corinthians that Christ having appeared to many others, last of all appeared to him also "as to one born out of due time."

Now it is quite plain from all this that in the very beginning of Christianity there was a well-known person named Saul of Tarsus, a leading Jew who displayed the most bitter hostility towards the new religion of Christianity, but who afterwards became its most firm and ardent supporter, and who always most consistently explained the great revolution in his life by referring it to the effects of a certain event which happened when on the way to Damascus to gratify to the full the very hostility which he then entertained towards the Christians. Now this tremendous change (for it *was* a tremendous change) in his character and actions must be explained on some ground or other. He was either an impostor, and said what he knew to be false with a view to deceive; or he was an enthu-

siast who imposed on himself and others, believing in an imaginary transaction which had never taken place; or he was deceived through the fraud of others, and all that he said or did must be supposed to be the result of that fraud; or else what he uniformly asserted to have been the cause of his conversion to Christianity did really happen, and therefore the Christian religion is a divine revelation from heaven, to man on earth. Now no one has ever been able to prove that the apostle could have had any rational grounds for attempting an imposture of the kind, or any likelihood of success in the means he adopted to carry out such an imposture, supposing he tried to do so. He had nothing to gain, but everything to lose socially, politically, and personally. As a matter of fact, he *did* lose everything by the change. From being rich he became poor, from being honoured he became despised, "We are made" (he said almost bitterly reviewing his position as a Christian teacher) "as the filth of the world, we are the offscouring of all things unto this day." He gained neither wealth, power, fame, nor pleasure, from the change, but he experienced henceforward a great deal of the contrary; nay, his very life itself was placed in constant jeopardy, and he himself tells us what he suffered in consequence of his adherence to, and his preaching of the new faith.

But it may be said, perhaps, that St. Paul was an enthusiast who conjured up certain things in an overheated imagination, and worked himself up into the absorbing idea that he had seen a vision from heaven. Well, that he was an enthusiast few will deny, and no great work will ever be accomplished in the world without enthusiasm; but in St. Paul's case the enthusiasm was of the right sort, it was not the enthusiasm of a fanatic, or of an ignorant man, or of one given to hallucinations and strange fantastic notions. Prudence, wisdom, foresight, practical good sense, uniformly characterised the acts and utterances of the apostle. No one with any sense could say that St. Paul was a fool. Nor was he an ignorant man, who could be easily led away, and imposed upon by superficial notions. He was on the contrary a student learned in Hebrew and Greek literature, and his writings prove that he was a man of ability and power, and had in no ordinary degree a mind of his own. Besides all this, enthusiasm runs in the direction of the natural bent of a man's disposition, but in St. Paul's case, it was the result of a most tremendous change that set in and ran counter to every former thought and desire of his life.

There remains the third explanation possible on the part of unbelievers, namely, that the apostle's change of mind was the result of a fraud practised on him by the Christians. Now this is so absurd a theory that it may be dismissed in a few words. It was morally impossible for the disciples of our Lord to conceive such a thought as that of turning the arch-persecutor into a preacher,

and this at the very moment of his greatest fury against them and their Divine Master. Did *they* produce the light in the heavens, did *they* create the voice, did *they* make him blind for three days, and after that restore his sight by a word? All this is to raise difficulties immeasurably greater than those presented by the narrative given to us in the Acts of the Apostles, and is a proof that unbelief for the most part demands more from its votaries than does a simple faith in the truth of the history as it has been handed down to us.

What remains then, brethren, but for us to believe that the Apostle did actually see the risen and ascended Christ that day while on the way to Damascus, and did hear the voice of His mouth, and so was converted to the faith of Jesus?

What follows? Well this, Christ is even now alive and in heaven! From heaven He carries on the work of His Church, and He sees what goes on, on this nether world in which we men and women live, and move, and have our being. Christ from heaven knew this Saul of Tarsus, saw what was in him, marked the indomitable energy, the strong conviction, the sincerity and resoluteness of the man, saw what a fitting instrument he was to carry on His work in the world. He thus became "a chosen vessel unto Him to bear His name before the Gentiles, and kings and children of Israel." Thus did the risen Lord from the throne of His glory announce to the terrified and stricken Saul his new and strange commission, to go to the Gentiles "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in Him."

Brethren, let us ask ourselves this afternoon, do we understand anything of this? Not—have we also received a share in the same glorious commission? for men like St. Paul are few and far between, nor yet have we also had a miraculous visitation from the opened heavens; but let us ask ourselves this question, Has there been any revelation to our souls of the risen and glorified Lord? Do we know Jesus Christ? Is He as a personal friend to us? Do we love Him? Have we fellowship and communion with Him? Have we realized the preciousness of His dear sacrifice for us on the Cross? do we trust in His blood for pardon and peace? are we drinking into His Spirit? are we learning to deny ourselves anything for His sake, "who loved us, and gave Himself for us?" Have we accepted a commission from Him to do a work in His name in this world? and do we hope to enter in by-and-by, and see His face in that world which is to come, and touch, if it may be, His wounds, and bask in His presence, and tell Him how much we love Him, who washed us from our sins in His own blood, and made us kings and priests unto God and His Father? To Whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

**PAMPHLET
and Advice
FREE**

Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to

MR. C. B. HARNESSES,
Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians),
for his New Medical Work, entitled
"Harnesse's Guide to Health,"
which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harnesse's Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESSES also gives Advice free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

HEALTH

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1889.

MONASTIC ORDERS.

THE speech of Archdeacon Farrar, at the meeting of the Southern Convocation, on Brotherhoods, has caused a great deal of discussion both in ecclesiastical and secular journals. Now we have a definite proposal shadowed forth by a Mr. Sharpe of Southampton, for the foundation of an Order of St. James, which shall carry out some, if not all, of the proposals of Archdeacon Farrar.

It is admitted on all sides, that if the Church is to deal effectively with the great "masses," something more is required than ordinary clerical work, and the pressure is so great, that it is impossible for the Additional Curates and the Church Pastoral Aid Societies to make grants sufficiently large to meet the requirements of the numerous parishes that are sorely in need of help. We are constantly hearing that the Additional Curates Society finds it impossible to meet the demands made upon it, and that it has continually to refuse applications, and so the result is, that a poor vicar must go plodding away, hoping against hope, with the ceaseless round of pastoral visitation, Day schools, Classes, Sunday work, with little help and very often not much sympathy from the outside world.

The plan of a Community of Brothers living together in a large parish, bound by certain obligations and rules, willingly accepted, giving what help they can to the vicar, is very beautiful, and we trust that it will soon become a reality. Many think that parochial work and mission work in general consist in preaching, holding forth either

in the streets, or in mission rooms, or wearing a surplice and reading lessons in church, and also doing any other work which a layman can do. We well remember hearing the present Bishop of Bedford state at the Wakefield Church Congress that he could get any number of preachers, but to find people ready to go and visit in some back slums was not so easy a matter; the fact is, that if the Church is to win its way among the masses, it will not be by merely preaching, but by daily contact with individual souls, dealing with them one by one. Multitudes are not gathered in at once, but by units, and very often does it happen that where there is the greatest excitement there is very soon a reaction when the excitement of the hour has passed away, and people come to realise the everyday life of the Christian in the world—that it is not soaring on eagle's wings, and singing exciting hymns, but bearing the daily cross that is to be borne by Christ's followers. We have had some experience of mission work, and the thought is borne upon us that after all dealing with men—working men and lads—we must come down to their level, and by this means raise them, and by avoiding sentimental talk deal with them as men who have to face the daily difficulties of life, and show to them how it is possible to be “diligent in business, fervent in spirit, and yet serving the Lord”; further we might say that this work, if it is to be lasting must be based on clear definite truths. If communities of men, Brotherhoods as they are sometimes called, are founded on these principles, they will do much good; if not, we are afraid that they will result in failure.

We imagine that these proposed Orders are to consist of men who will virtually renounce the world, and live together bound by the vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience; there is much that is beautiful in all this, and where it is voluntarily entered into, with full purpose of heart, it must result in good, and we are glad that this idea has been brought forward by one who certainly cannot be charged with sympathising with the extreme party in the Church. There is the danger, alluded to by one of the Bishops, viz., there *might* be friction between the regular parochial clergy and this new body, and if we are to look at the precedents which history supplies, we find that there was anything but an amicable feeling between the secular clergy, as they were called, and the members of the various Orders of Friars, who we are told used to come and set up their pulpit in the villages, and inveigh against the habits of the resident clergy. Of course times are changed, and if these Orders are revived, there must of necessity be an understanding that no community shall settle in any parish without the consent of the vicar; that they shall work under his direction, the visitor being the Bishop of the Diocese, that all matters of dispute—if any should arise—should be absolutely settled by him, and

that his decision should be final. It should moreover be understood that the work is to help the Church, to set forth the missionary aspect of the Church as the true home of the people, to teach and instruct in the Faith, and to set forth Christianity in its practical aspect, coping with the great problems of sin and wickedness, and by word and work bringing back wanderers to the fold.

We want no slavish imitations of mediæval days, but the times evidently require some vigorous action of aggressive Christianity to reclaim the wandering and wayward ones of the flock, and if these Orders can be utilised for this great end, we cannot doubt but that all Churchmen will cordially welcome the efforts thus made.

ON THE MORAL ASPECTS OF A LABOUR STRIKE.

IN treating of this subject, I cannot separate the moral aspects of a strike from its economical aspects; the two are much more closely connected than is at first evident. Nor can I discuss strikes, and their policy or impolicy, without speaking of particular cases, of course the late Dock Strike among the rest. Not that I have personal knowledge of its incidents; but I have had personal knowledge of many others, and have been several times a party in dealing with them.

I think I had better, in the first place, say what I can to correct what I think a most mischievous error, both moral and economical, which multitudes of persons act on, while hardly one of them would admit that he holds it. It is the unuttered prejudice or feeling that in any bargain of trade, in some more than in others, the bargainers on the two sides must be opposed in interest; that in trade it ever happens that what is one man's gain must be another man's loss. For when two men make a bargain, both of them hope for, and both generally obtain, some benefit. In a bargain of labour the employer gets the labour and the labourer gets the wages. Neither of them would enter on the bargain unless for some advantage for himself. Were it otherwise, there could be no trade and no production. When people gamble and produce nothing, what is one man's gain is evidently another's loss. But in trade the object is production, or exchange from one to another of what one has and the other wants, for valuable considerations. The maxim or sentiment of which I speak is really a maxim of gamblers, and is profoundly immoral and selfish as well as anti-economical.

It is not only so, but is in the long run utterly false. It is quite true that in each particular item of dealing it is the interest of each of the parties to do the best for himself that he can. But it is not so in the sum, or average, of transactions. Certainly not in the whole sum of all transactions over the world during, say, a year; and, almost always, not in the sum of any one individual's transactions during a year. To take a case: It is very seldom the true interest of a maker of goods to get for a prolonged period an extremely high price for them. Not only he raises up competition against himself; but, in getting the extreme price from his customers, he is frequently laying a foundation for their ultimate insolvency.

Now of all the cases in which a very hard bargain

is the least to the advantage of the successful bargainer, a bargain for labour is the most decidedly so. The reason is, that the employer agrees not for a piece of goods the quality of which he can judge of with his hands and eyes, but for an article that is produced from day to day, from hour to hour, and from minute to minute; and that he cannot reject for being insufficient in quality; he can only refuse to accept more of it. This quality, too, which is of importance to him, and which he can easily recognise while he cannot always very well define it, is by the very nature of the case dependent, more or less, and often immensely, on the good will of the labourer, which good will must be paid for in every instance but one in a thousand or a million. If this were not so, and if the above does not embody what I do not shrink from calling a principle, then slave labour must be cheaper than free labour, which it notoriously is not. And extending the principle, I do not hesitate to say that cheap free labour is almost always bad; and, no matter how cheap on paper, almost always dear.

If all this is but economical A B C and mere truism, my apology for the apparent trifling must be, that in recent discussion on the Dock Strike the majority of persons seem to take it for granted that the dock and shipowners *cannot afford* to pay more than so-and-so, or cannot both pay more and make an ordinary profit. It is tacitly taken for granted that an advanced scale of wages will, as matter of course, procure no more in return than a low scale. It may be that it will not just at once; and it is certainly true that it will not in the case of every particular labourer. But it is very nearly certain, as nearly certain as anything of the kind can be, that in the long run a well-paid set of labourers will give at the very-worst as much value for the same money as an ill-paid set. Mr. Giffen has estimated that between advanced rates of wages, shortening of time of work, and increased cheapness of things which for the most part wages are expended in, the skilled and unskilled labourers of England are at this time receiving a rate of wages two and a-half times as great as their predecessors of fifty years ago were. Yet this economic movement has been accompanied by—nay, it has been caused by, but I need not go into that—an increased production of capital to a very much larger proportional extent. I was going to say something of my own experience of the improvement of the quality of labour as wages have risen, but my experience but confirms Mr. Giffen's conclusion, which is that the dear labour is no dearer than the cheap. Of course all this is subject to particular correction and exception. A man may be spoiled by having his wages raised too fast as a *merchant may be injured by making money too rapidly*. But for one instance of this there are a thousand the other way. If the high wages and the large profits come naturally and unforced, they are a healthy result as well as a healthy symptom, and the high wages do not represent, as some of the older economists thought, any lessening of capital and profit.

This is, perhaps, mere political economy, but I humbly think it is morality and Christianity too. Godliness is profitable, it is said in the New Testament, and the Old says that the liberal deviseth liberal things, and by liberal things shall he stand. I believe economics to be a moral as well as an exact science, resembling in this the science of the laws of health.

To proceed with the consideration of the policy of trade strikes, and how they ought to be dealt with.

It is pretty evident that if the ideas which I hold were general among those who employ and those who exercise labour, and if the knowledge of the principle were also general, that demand and nothing else determines price or value, trade strikes and locks out would nearly cease, or would at least lose nearly all their acrimony, which acrimony is a terrible evil. Referring to the above economic law, that demand is the cause of value, this is pretty generally admitted as a mere proposition, while very likely most persons discount its universality by a belief, often vigorously enough expressed, that unions and combinations can modify its action. My belief is that this is fallacious, and that unions and combinations, when they appear to have effects on prices of labour in its primary form, or of any other commodity, are at the very most the machinery through which *the effects are produced, and in no case the cause*, and in no case produce permanent results. This is not a place to offer any lengthened reasoning to prove this; but I may allude to the failure of all "corners," "syndicates," etc., to effect more than temporary disturbance of prices; and I may ask, How is it possible that the commodity labour can be the only one not subject to the Law of Demand? I speak here of such combinations as are entered on to raise or lower wages; there is another class of combinations, the object of which is to limit the supply of particular kinds of skilled labour. These may be effectual for a far longer time than the ordinary kind of which I am speaking, while at length they are invariably injurious to the permanent interests of the parties in them. But no matter how correct men's opinions on economical subjects might become, there are motives other than mere economical calculations that dispose men's actions. There is greed, there is passion, there is social enmity—sentiments that scientific progress will and can never extinguish. All that people can be taught is, that acknowledgment and observance of scientific law must be for their benefit.

For labourers to leave off work, or for employers to stop work, is for the period an utter loss that can never be recouped. It is the same kind of measure as for the Dutch to cut down the spice trees of the Indian islands, and the Marseilles cornfactors to cast half their grain into the sea, to maintain the price of the rest. It must needs however be that offences will come. I have had to do with several strikes of workmen for higher wages. None of them ever gave me much trouble; and, with two exceptions, it was not my fault that there were strikes. When I had learned, by a little experience, what to do, the following was my course of action; I relate the particulars of one instance. A number of men came to me with their demand; a quite unexpected one. I said: "You have considered about this before you have applied to me; I must consider before I reply." They wanted an immediate reply. "If I give you an immediate reply," I said, "it must be No. I have others to consult, and I have to ascertain what wages other people are paying." They left me, but that evening struck work. I waited till they came back, which was very soon. These men knew that I would be guided by what I learned was the current rate of wages, if indeed I was not properly informed of it already. I was very particular, during and after the transaction, not to quarrel with them, or have any sharp words. On another occasion I met a similar demand, which I expected, and considered altogether unwarranted, with a positive refusal. The men turned out, and stayed away for a week.

I have been a witness of many strikes in which I was not involved, and was always impressed, when they were over, no matter what the results, with the languid, listless manner and appearance of those who had taken this dismal holiday. There is not a feature in the business that is good, and in every case, if the labourers had proceeded differently, the results would have been just what they were. No employer who pays lower than current wages can keep his men, and the way that wages generally advance is by some beginning being made, in a few cases, that give a model for the rest, just as the price of any article varies. If the cruel waste of strength that is caused by a strike of work had to be suffered whenever the price of the quarter loaf has to be adjusted, London, aye, England, would be brought to a state of starvation for half-a-dozen weeks of every year.

Disbelieving as I do in all trade combinations, and even regarding them as immoral, I never entered into any with employers of the same kind of labour as myself. I think it likely that the knowledge of this by my men prevented, on various occasions, the occurrence of any of that acrimony between us that is so common in labour disputes. But in the particular case of the recent Dock Strike, I must make an exception to this disapproval of mine of combinations. The various dock companies of London are not simply employers of labour. They exist under Acts of Parliament that give them certain privileges, even monopolies. No one dock company can legitimately act, in a matter that involves the action of all the rest, alone. So that I do not condemn, in this instance, the various dock companies making common cause and acting together.

If we are correctly informed, the initial movement of the recent strike was by a deputation that waited on the dock people *with certain demands*, to which an immediate answer was required. Whether the demands were reasonable or not—and so far as I can judge they were so in the bulk—they should have been met with a refusal of reply without deliberation. I believe they were met with the most absurd reply that it is possible to give; that is, a *non possumus*. "I cannot afford it" is no answer to a demand for an advance of price of anything. Whether you can afford it or not you must pay the market price for what you buy, or do without, and employers of labour cannot do without the labour. Neither, of course, can labourers do without employment. But the whole affair seems to have been botched. Then came a set of go-betweens, invited and uninvited, and extern support was given in large amounts to the strikers. As matters have terminated, great credit is being given to some of these mediators. They are entitled to no credit. The issue is, in my belief, materially the same as it would and must have been had there been no mediators, but a good deal later, probably three weeks later, than if these had never interfered.

All this I say with reserve, although not with much. There are some things that have been stated about "sweating," and about the sale of beer to the men on the very dock-edges by persons who pay the dock people for the privilege, that seriously injure the moral case of the dock owners. But all this, however it may be pleaded as set-off, does not form a justification of the aggressive manner in which the demand for advance of pay and change of system was made. When a man wants a higher price from his customers for his goods he never accompanies his application with a threat. The only class of sellers who do, and

in whom it is not considered absurd and wrong, are the sellers of labour, and people who call themselves their friends are most injudicious in encouraging the habit.

The only argument that is ever advanced, of the nature of a common-sense economical argument, in favour of the practice of striking work to enforce a request, is one that I admit puzzled me when I first heard it. "What does a trader do," I have heard it asked, "when he wants a larger price for his goods? Does he not refuse to sell? And what, other than this, do the labourers do who refuse to go on with their work?" The fallacy in this is, that the maker of goods who wants a higher price *does not cease to produce his goods*. The real analogy to the men who refuse to work, and thereby annihilate their own labour by its non-exercise, is not of a manufacturer who withdraws his goods from the market while he goes on making them, but of one who ceases to produce; a thing that no one ever does when trade is good, but that many often do and must do when they cannot sell.

The main economical argument against the practice of leaving off work to enforce a request is the well-known one that a diminution of capital, which the cessation of labour must cause, diminishes the demand for labour. A demand for labour comes from capital, and can come from nothing else. The interests—the permanent standing interests—of those who exercise and those who employ labour are not, and cannot be, hostile to each other. As reasonable is it to think that the permanent interests of the tillers of the ground, and of those who take their produce and consume it, or work it up and return it to the cultivators, can be opposed. All misconceptions about these things have their origin in the un-Christian sentiment that what is one man's gain must be another man's loss.

Both parties in the recent dispute have suffered, and both, owing to their own faults, have more to suffer. Trade in London has undergone a diminution which may be permanent. Whether so or not, the apparent advantage which the dock labourers have gained might have been gained at far less cost, perhaps at no cost, and might have been real and not apparent. I do not fear what is called Socialism in connection with this business; our common people are too sensible, as the last month has proved, for that. They have, in fact, shown no more ignorance of economic truth than others who should know better. But I do fear a recurrence of mistakes, and I more than fear, I know, that these mistakes do harm to everybody, economically and morally also.

If I were better informed than I am, I should have some remarks to make on the use of intimidation to make a strike of work general. This is not only utterly wrong morally, but is criminal, being a violent interference with men's rights. All picketing, etc., is of the same nature, while it may not pass into open acts of violence. My impression is that while there was undoubtedly some of this during the last month, there was less in proportion to the magnitude of the operations than perhaps ever occurred before in any similar instance.

—♦—

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." October, 1889. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE paper that occupies the most space in this number of the *Expositor*—to wit, Professor Massie's "Conversion of St. Paul"—would have been much better if the really solid matter it contains had been more concisely expressed. And we must enter a strong protest against the opening sentence: "Next to the Resurrection of Christ, the most momentous event in the history of Christianity is the conversion of Paul." The Resurrection is *not* "an event in the history of Christianity," since, without it, Christianity would in St. Paul's own words be a vain faith; that first Easter is the birthday of Christianity, not an event in its history. And to say that St. Paul's conversion was "its enlargement and universality" is, to say the least, a most unfortunate expression; for though St. Paul *saw* that Christianity was larger and more universal than even the Apostles thought it to be, yet he did not *make* it so. Otherwise the paper is an able answer to modern explainers-away of the miraculous element in the New Testament.

Mr. Selby's article on "Heredity and its Evangelical Analogies" is as interesting as it is able. We have wished there were a little less of Professor Massie; we wish there were much more of Mr. Selby, who most ably wrenches the scientific doctrines of hereditary tendencies and transmission of habits out of the hands of the materialist for the service of the apologist.

Professor Cheyne writes sensibly this month on the 86th Psalm; his remarks on the second verse are very helpful, though we do not like his translation, "Preserve thou my soul, for I am one that loves." But we freely admit that *לִי יְהוָה* is a word not very easy to find an English equivalent for.

We have excused ourselves from reading Principal Brown's paper, "The Neronic Date of the Apocalypse Untenable," not from any want of respect to its author, but simply because we are already fully persuaded that the Neronic date is against all Patristic, internal and external, probability; in fact, it is based on nothing but false German theories.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DIVINE INFLUENCES TRANSFORMING HUMAN CHARACTER.

SIR,—There seems nothing so agreeable to "J. B." as charging people with misrepresenting him. I may be wrong, but I do not think I am, when I say in such a case I should ask seriously if there were not something not altogether right in my style.

The words, "that one of the great objects which the Scheme of Redemption accomplishes is the correction of defective and perverted faculties," must have been written in some connection. What was that connection? Taken by themselves they have no meaning. No one doubts their truth. If "J. B." says that the scheme does not work beyond the grave—I understood the contrary—then will he tell us why he penned the words?

Now, I have no wish to pervert "J. B.'s" meaning, but I must ask him to show how he arrives at what to me is astounding doctrine, "that hell is not endless, but the way to righteousness." I have read the beautiful words and rejoiced in them: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." I have never yet read that . . . it is too shocking to pen the words. And here let me say that I do not regard any name as authoritative in perverting the "truth of God."

I should be very glad if "J. B." would tell us how he arrives at the conclusion that hell is not endless from the teaching of Col. i. 16-20, Eph. i. 9-10, John xii. 32. To my mind there is not the remotest hint of anything of the kind there.

Dogma is the foundation of faith. "J. B." now admits this. He says that he never intended anything else. I am sorry I misunderstood him. I have not the paper to refer to, and so cannot ascertain exactly how I was misled. I remember distinctly a comment made by a friend who read the letters: "It is considered bad form in these days to be too tenacious of dogma." Certainly this was the impression made on my mind. I am very glad it was otherwise.

I suppose, as "J. B." quotes Mr. Gladstone, that he approves of what he says when he writes, "that the Augustinian theology put forth dogmas which inspire aversion among persons of intelligence and culture, living in our age, even when they are good and devoted men." This means, I suppose, that the theology in question inspired aversion in Mr. Gladstone. I do not know that Mr. Gladstone has a right to say more. Then the question becomes a personal one. Is Mr. Gladstone a good man? Is he a devoted one? Wherein does his goodness consist? To what is he devoted? Then what is the Augustinian theology? Is it the teaching of the Bible? We open up here endless questions which are all beside the mark. "To the word and to the testimony." What does the Bible say? We shall not be accounted righteous for our faith in men at all. Let us not then pin our faith to men's coat-tails.

I am glad "J. B." does not feel able to controvert the death-bed position, for that is the true test of the value of religion. The true Christian knows where he is going. "I know in whom I have believed. . . ." "I am now ready to be offered up, and the hour of my departure is at hand. . . . Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give to me, and not to me only, but (N.B., he does not say to all irrespectively) to all them also that love His appearing." There are many kinds of death-bed scenes when the person is not a true Christian. My reference, on the other hand, was to one who died with a dead conscience. I am sorry "J. B." should see his way to throw a veil over these facts. "We speak of things we do know."

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, October 5th, 1889.

DEFENCE OF THE COMMUNICATED ARTICLE OF AUGUST 31ST.

SIR,—When I maintained the three Orders from the Preface to the Ordinal, all I meant was that it said: "From the Apostles' time there have been three Orders in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Does not this mean that they were by the Apostles instituted? If not, was it by some independent of, or in opposition to, the Apostles? What

is the theory? Bishop Lightfoot says that St. John, at the latest, gave constitution to the Diocesan system, to be read in St. Paul to Timothy and Titus. When I said that we ordain those pretending to Presbyterian orders, my meaning was plain enough, though my words, probably, were not exact. We, by our act, say that there were no Orders before. I would ask "C. P. M." what he means when he tells the Almighty, "Thou hast appointed divers Orders in Thy Church," if he believes that *appointed* would as well apply to Hindooism or Mahometanism in India? In fact, if *appointed* means only *permitted*, a Presbyterian might use our Ember Prayer. "C. P. M." also introduces inspiration. If this means divine, infallible guidance, it seems denied not only to books and miracles in the Old Testament, but also to our Lord's testimony thereto.

THE WRITER OF THE
COMMUNICATED ARTICLE.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words on Mr. Rawstorne's letter on this subject? The backbone of the whole argument is, that St. Paul at Ephesus uses the term overseers vaguely with reference to the second order, whereas in his epistles to Timothy and Titus he confines it to the first. But vagueness proves nothing. Thus we speak of the three orders as "Clergy"; and, in the prayer for the clergy, we group together two orders, or two states in the Church, as "Curates." The question is simply this, did St. Paul, in his epistles to Timothy and Titus, ascribe to one officer the ruling of a number of Clergy, the ordaining, rewarding, punishing, promoting? If this be so, how agrees it with the parity of all? Mr. Rawstorne seems to doubt what Bishop Lightfoot asserts, that before St. John's death episcopacy was universal. If a committee recognised Presbyterian orders, the Church does not. It ordains those, pretending to orders, before she allows them to serve. While we make all lawful concessions, we must be limited by Scripture, and the Prayer which we profess to believe. If God has appointed "divers orders," we must not set His ordinances aside, even for peace sake. What the Queen does is no rule to us. If she is head of the Church that only means that she is ruler of the Clergy as well as of the Laity, and that in her law courts all cases must be tried. We are not bound by her private acts, no more than by those of Charles II., or Henry VIII. HENRY JAMES RINGWOOD.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Akenhead, Rev. E., Senior Curate of St. Mary's and St. Nicholas's, Beverley; Incumbent of Scunthorpe, Lincolnshire.
Arnold, Rev. Charles Lowther, Curate of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton; Vicar of Waverton, Chester.
Barnett, Rev. Arthur T., late Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society; English Chaplain at Bordighera, Italy.
Benson, Rev. William Matthew, Vicar of St. Nicholas's, in Deeping Fen, Lincolnshire.
Bishop, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of St. Polycarp's, Everton; Vicar of the New Church of St. John's in the parish of St. Chrysostom's, Liverpool.
Blunt, Rev. A. C., M.A., Rector of Burghclere; Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral.
Butterworth, Rev. T. G., B.A., Vicar of Great Ouseburn, York.
Corfield, Rev. Ashley Tregoning, Curate of Balderstone; Vicar of Tockholes, Blackburn.
Cotton, Rev. James Liggins, M.A., Vicar of Clifton Hampden, Oxon.
Davies, Rev. Clement, M.A., Curate of Rhyl; Vicar of Caerfallwch, Flintshire.
Duke, Rev. R. R., B.A., Rector of Nafford-with-Birlingham; Rural Dean of Pershore.
Edwards, Rev. Daniel, M.A., Vicar of Northop; Rector of Llany Cil, Bala.
Gedge, Rev. J. W., Rector of Buriton; Rector of South Hackney.
Hadden, Rev. R. H., Vicar of Aldgate; Chaplain to the Lord Mayor-elect (Alderman Sir Henry Isaacs).
Hughes, Rev. Hugh Trevor, Vicar of Nerquis, Flintshire; Vicar of Bistre, near Hawarden, Flintshire.
Jenkins, Rev. David William, B.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Aberswisth; Vicar of St. Mary's, Pembroke.
Keene, Rev. Frank William, Vicar of Misson, Notts.
Kennaway, Rev. Richard Arthur, M.A., Rector of Norton Davie, otherwise Green's Norton, Northamptonshire.
Lester, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield and Rector of St. John's, South Hackney; Rector of Buriton, Hants.
Lever, Rev. Robert, M.A., Curate of Withybrooke; Vicar of Hillmorton, Rugby.
Lewis, Rev. Richard D., Chaplain to the *Himalaya*.
Moor, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Barton-on-Humber.
Rice, Rev. Alwyne C. H., M.A., Chaplain to the *Bellerophon*.
Richardson, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Rhyl; Vicar of Northop, Flintshire.
Sim, Rev. Stewart, M.A., Vicar of Lower Brixham, Devonshire.
Smith, Rev. A. Kirke, M.A., Vicar of Somersham-with-Pidley-cum-Fenton and Colne; Rector of Boxworth, Cambridgeshire.
Smith-Masters, Rev. J. E., M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Tilehurst; Vicar of Kidmore End, Oxfordshire.
Sutherland, Rev. William Sheppard, Incumbent of Kilnemanagh, Ireland; Rector of Westborough-with-Dry Doddington.
Swithinbank, Rev. John Edwin, M.A., Rector of Saltfleetby St. Clement, Louth.
Thomason, Rev. William, Vicar of Tockholes; Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels', Blackburn.
Tredennick, Rev. G. N. H., B.A., Curate of Emmanuel Church, Hastings; Vicar of Christ Church, Sparkbrook, Birmingham.
Wilson, Rev. Studholme, M.A., Vicar of Burley, Ringwood; Rector of Millbrook, near Southampton.
York, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Chaplain to the Royal Marine Division at Forton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barnes, Rev. Reginald, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, Oxford, Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral, at 190, Earl's-court-road, S.W., on 29th ult., in the 59th year of his age.
Lillistone, Rev. John Samuel, late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, at 26, Craven-park, Willesden, on the 1st inst., aged 57.
Stonhouse, Rev. Frederick, Rector of Honily, on the 29th ult., at Kenilworth, aged 74.



The Church of England Pulpit.

"WORK FOR THE KING."

BY THE BISHOP OF OSSORY.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. CANICE'S CATHEDRAL, KILKENNY, AT THE ANNUAL FESTIVAL OF THE GIRLS' FRIENDLY SOCIETY, ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4TH, 1889.

"Ittai answered the King, and said, As the Lord liveth, and as my lord the king liveth, surely in what place my lord the king shall be, whether in death or life, even there also will thy servant be."—2 SAM. xv. 21.

THESE were the words of a loyal and devoted subject to a good and gracious king. That king, as we have heard in the lesson to-day, was now flying into exile amid the sorrow of his followers. Ittai, who was only a stranger from the land of the Philistines, but who had attached himself to the king and was serving under him, was anxious to accompany him in his solitude and sorrow; and the words he spoke showed that he had not only resolved to be with his king in times of joy and victory, but he was willing to be with him in peril, and, if need be, in defeat. We read to-day how the king remonstrated with his servant, because he was but an exile and a stranger himself, entreating him to return to the city and not to share his broken fortunes. But Ittai answered, "As the Lord liveth, and as my lord the king liveth, surely in what place my lord the king shall be, whether it be in life or death, there also will thy servant be." He loved his king all the more because he was a rejected king, and because he was a man of sorrows. I hope there are many amongst us who would feel sentiments of a like kind even with regard to our earthly sovereign. But do not these words of Ittai call up higher and loftier thoughts; do they not remind us that there is another King, one Jesus, the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; the One who passed over this very brook Kedron over which David passed that day, and One who passed in sorrow, for our deliverance and for our salvation. Surely, if the words of Ittai were noble words spoken about an earthly king, we may make them still nobler words if from our hearts we speak them, and if in our hearts we feel them towards our heavenly King. I trust the language of Ittai will find a response in all your hearts. And are they not, my dear young friends, especially suitable for the members of this Girl's Friendly Society—for all who are attached to its principles, and all who desire honestly and

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 721.

faithfully to carry them out in their lives. What is the object of this society? Is it not to help, encourage, and strengthen one another in serving our King; in consecrating our hearts and lives to purity, goodness, and usefulness in that Master's service. We should take Him as our King wherever He would have us to go, and be with that Master wherever we know He is, so that we may find our joy and peace in Him. And now, what ought to be the constraining motive of language such as this when we address it to our King? I have told you that Ittai was a foreigner. David had probably met him in the land of the Philistines, where, as you know, it was David's lot to sojourn more than once, and he seems to have won the heart of that stranger, and probably not only won him into his service, but into the service of the King of heaven. Probably he became a follower of the true God, and went to Jerusalem to worship Him in His temple. And this would attach him all the more to his king after he had forsaken his own people and his own country. Here, then, is the secret and the source of all true devotedness to Christ. We must renounce all other masters and take Him as our Lord. We must be ready to give up the world that would claim us, and give ourselves to Him who died to redeem us with His precious blood. Our language should be that of the prophet, who said, "Other lords beside Thee have had dominion over us, but by Thee only will we make mention of Thy name." This lies at the root of all religion—to know what Christ has done for us, and then to give ourselves to Him who bought us with His precious blood. You may remember the words of the hymn that says,

"The King of Love my Shepherd is,
Whose goodness faileth never;
I nothing lack if He is mine
And I am His for ever."

You know that in the case of an earthly king the wish of the sovereign is a command; and every faithful servant, even of an earthly sovereign, will feel obedience to his command to be a duty, a privilege, and a delight. I remember to have read of a soldier of the Emperor Napoleon who was carried back from the battle grievously wounded. While the surgeon was probing for the bullet that had shot the soldier down, the wounded man said, "One inch deeper, surgeon, and you'll find the Emperor." What he meant by that was that his honour and love for the Emperor were enshrined in his very heart; that he was ready, like Ittai, whether in life or death, to have his king near him. And to have Christ in our hearts the hope of glory, to have Him enshrined there in our inmost affections, because He loved us and gave Himself for us, that is the secret and that is the motive of all true religion and devotion.

Now, to look at this subject from a practical point of view. All the duties of our daily life, whatever they may be, are a part of our service for the

King. Let us not think of our duties to the King as merely confined to what are more expressly religious duties. Let us remember the words of our catechism—"To do my duty in that state of life to which it shall please God to call me." Now, that duty may be of various kinds. It may be in your quiet homes—and I suppose for many of you, as daughters or as sisters, it is there your lot is cast. But wherever your lot is cast, whether at home or abroad, the one great thing to keep in view is the service of the King. You remember the words of the Apostle when he said, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." And again, "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men." Now, it would be a great help to you all, my dear young friends, to keep this thought in view with regard to all the duties of your life. The humblest place will become honourable if you fill it for the King; the meanest work will be dignified if it is done for the King; the most difficult work will become easy if you do it for the King; and the most trying work will become pleasant if you feel that it is done for Him. "As the Lord liveth, and as my lord the king liveth, surely in what place my lord the king shall be, whether in death or life, even there also will thy servant be." One of our Christian poets has said—

"A servant, with the the clause,
Makes drudgery divine;
Who sweeps a room as by His laws,
Makes that and the action fine."

Now, with regard to that expression of Ittai's—"In whatsoever place the king is, surely there also will thy servant be," it seems to have been his wish and his rule to keep as near the king as he possibly could; beneath his eye for guidance; near to his hand to help; within the royal precincts of his palace, if that were the king's desire; and with him on the field of battle, if that were the king's command. A great lesson comes to us from this. It teaches us that our service for our heavenly King is not to be an occasional but a constant thing. We are not to take up God's service at random and lay it down through caprice; we are not to be serving God to-day and the world to-morrow; we are not to be serving the Lord Jesus one hour and serving ourselves the next, but evermore let the thought be in our heart, "My King, Thy will be done." Now, there is another thought here which it is important to bear in mind, and that is, that nearness to the King is the best help we can have for His service. Our fruitfulness depends on union with Christ. Life for Him must spring out of life in Him, and life for Him will then lead to life with Him when all our duties here are done. You remember the words of the Master, "Abide in me and I in you; as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in Me." How near that thought must have been to the

heart of the great Apostle of Ireland, St Patrick, when he wrote the words we sang to-day—"Christ be with me; Christ within me; Christ behind me; Christ before me; Christ beside me; Christ to comfort and restore me; Christ be near me; Christ above me; Christ in the hearts of all that love Him." How, then, are we to have His presence and His blessing? By the means of grace He has Himself appointed; by earnest and daily prayer to God for His holy Spirit; by the study and reading of His word, which is a lamp to our feet; and by loving His holy Day, His Sanctuary and His holy Table. It is wonderful how one who enjoys communion with the King will be strengthened for all work and all duty. Sometimes one meets with some quiet Christian workers, and all work seems to be easy to them. There is no fuss, no haste, no discouragement, and no despair. All seems to be done with ease and freedom. If we could follow these servants to their inmost shrines of heart and thought we would find that they were living with the King, and that therein lay their strength. Another of our great poets has used those beautiful words—

"When one who holds communion with the skies
Has filled his urn, where these pure waters rise,
And once more mingles with us meaner things,
'Tis e'en as if an angel shook his wings.
Ethereal fragrance fills the circuit wide,
And tells us whence his treasures are supplied."

Another blessed thought for you, my friends, is that every servant of the King may be near the King—near to Him not only as His servant and His soldier, but near Him as His friend, yea, as the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty. And He will help them and strengthen them. In this word of Ittai's there is a word of caution as well as a word of help. "In what place my Lord the King shall be, there also will His servant be." Never be found where you feel your King could not be with you. Keep from the scenes, and the associations, and the companionships on which you could not ask His blessing. Ask yourself, "Can I carry the presence of my King with me into such and such a place, or such and such an association?" and unless you can, remember that these places and these associations will injure you and will mar your spiritual life. If you are with the King in life you know His promise that He will be with you in death. Did you not sing to-day, in the glorious words of the Psalmist, "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me." We shall need His presence then. O, let us seek to have His presence now, and, dwelling with Him in our life, He will not forsake us when we are passing through that valley through which He passed Himself. And then we shall not be done with His presence; and in His presence there is fulness of joy, and at His right hand there are pleasures for evermore. "Thine eyes shall see

the King in His beauty, and they shall behold the land that is very far off." Then you will know, as you never knew on earth, what the rich meaning of that promise is, "I will be with thee."

"Then within His palace
You shall praise on joyful strings,
Him the only Potentate,
Lord of lords and King of kings."

Now, dear young friends, if you carry away no other thought from this happy day, this bright day with which the King has favoured us, carry away this thought of Ittai's in your heart. Resolve in God's grace to do what Ittai resolved to do—to be with the King, and on the side of the King, through all life with all its duties, its trials, and temptations. Pray as Ittai did to be strengthened by being near to the King. Live for Him, live in His presence now, and live in the hope of dwelling with Him after death. Cultivate, too, union and sympathy and kindness towards your fellow-members. Help them by your example, and aid them by your prayers. Be real sisters in the Lord, one to the other. Whatever work you do, let it be for the King, first yielding your hearts to Him, and enshrining Him within them, and then giving your life and heart and all to His blessed service.

CHRISTIAN GRATITUDE.

BY THE REV. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A., VICAR
OF BRIGSTOCK.

SERMON PREACHED AT THE HARVEST THANKSGIVING SERVICE AT BRIGSTOCK, ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 22ND, 1889.

"What shall I render unto the Lord for all His benefits towards me? I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord."—Ps. cxvi. 16, 17.

THERE is, perhaps, nothing more general than ingratitude. It is no uncommon thing: we meet with it everywhere. It obtains in all relations of life and amongst all sorts and conditions of men. Men are ungrateful towards one another and towards God. Gratitude is almost the last thing that we expect to meet with. The reflection is a sad one, but there is only too much occasion for it.

And yet the wheels of every-day life would run much more smoothly and pleasantly if they received occasionally only a little of the oil of gratitude. Nothing encourages so much to further deeds of benevolence as gratitude. Men like gratitude. Gratitude, like the sun in the heavens, shedding its light and heat on all around and inciting everything to progress, disposes all hearts upon which it falls to nobler deeds of philanthropy. What a different world this would be if there were more gratitude in it; if servants were more grateful to their masters, and masters to their servants; if parents were more grateful to their children and

children to their parents; husbands were more grateful to their wives, and wives to their husbands; if, in short, there were in all the relations of life a greater disposition to appreciate and be grateful for everything that each does for the other. We should have that state brought about which the Apostle enjoins when he says: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." And happiness would take the place of misery, and prosperity the place of adversity. Self-seeking is no secure path to well-being. He is the happiest man who, from gratitude for what he has received, seeks most to promote the welfare of his fellow-creatures.

Our experience, in passing through life, is very varied. Days are not all sunshine, and nights are not all peaceful rest. Seasons, too, as they run their course, are not always propitious. Cold winds blow in spring, and nip the budding trees and cut down the growing herb. Storms and tempests and cloudy skies retard in summer the ripening fruits of the earth. And often in autumn there are many reasons to fear that our barns will not be filled with all manner of store. We are anxious and filled with dread for the coming winter. The state without is often but a true picture of the condition within. We do not know whence deliverance will come, and yet we do not want. "The lions do lack and suffer hunger, but they that love the Lord want nothing that is good."

This year has not been wanting in causes for anxiety—a backward spring, no rain in June, too much in July and August, induced the fear that things would go hard with us. How, if there be no fine weather in September, could the harvest escape being spoilt? Such were the thoughts that troubled anxious men! Yet the fine weather came and God has again verified His promise, "While the earth remained, seed time and harvest shall not cease." "Oh," some will say, "but the crops are poor; the harvest is not a plentiful one." This is true, too true. And it is also true that the loss will be felt by one class more than by others. In Austria and in Germany great fears are already being very loudly expressed that the poor man's loaf will be very dear during the coming winter. There are, happily, no such fears at home. The short harvest will be felt principally by one class only, and this class the growers. They will be the principal, if not the only, sufferers. They need, and ought to have on this account, our special sympathy. It is this, amongst other adverse circumstances, that has brought about that state of things which justifies the Farmers' Benevolent Fund—the cause for which we plead this morning, the cause to which I hope you will give liberally. The harvest, we have observed, is not an abundant one. This should cause great searchings of heart. Why? Some people would answer, The explanation of the short crop is the unpropitious season. But this is only half the explanation. There is a

God who rules in heaven, and He orders the seasons. Evil doth not come of the dust. One of old asked, "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done?" But why has the Lord sent evil? Rather let us ask, for that is the better way, Why hath not the Lord sent us greater good? This question admits of an easy answer. And the answer is twofold.

It is found in our sins—sins of commission and omission. We will not examine into all that we have done amiss. How great would be the sum of it! We will only just glance at what we have left undone. It is our duty, as it is our privilege, to pray and ask a blessing upon our labour. "Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it." Except the Lord till the ground, their labour is but lost that till it. And yet how much—rather how little—of our time have we spent on our knees asking the Lord of the Harvest to crown our labours with success? We know. God knows. And if the truth were told the sum of it would be but little. How much have we asked? We will put the question another way: How much more have we received than we deserved?

And yet there seemed a time when our dangers were great, when calamities to the harvest were imminent. From these dangers and calamities we have been spared. We have had a return of fine weather, and the harvest has been housed. It is none of our making, and the fear is it is none of our seeking. It is God's free gift. And it takes the shape of a great deliverance. It calls for abundant manifestations of gratitude. This is the occasion of this day's services. We desire to thank God that He has given us the harvest, that He has not destroyed it, as our sins deserved, in the field. Our call is that of the hymn:—

Come, ye thankful people, come,
Raise the song of Harvest-home;
All is safely gathered in
Ere the winter storms begin.

God, our Maker, doth provide
For our wants to be supplied.
Come to God's own temple, come,
Raise the song of Harvest-home.

But now the great question arises, How shall we show our gratitude to God for His temporal mercies—the blessings of the harvest? Our text illustrates our point. Let us see this.

The Psalm, whence the text is taken, describes the Psalmist's troubles and his deliverance out of them. The troubles were great, the deliverance was significant. He describes his troubles in graphic terms. "The sorrows of death compassed me and the pains of hell gat hold upon me. I found trouble and sorrow." The deliverance is no less beautifully portrayed. "Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. I will walk before the Lord in the land of the living." But this is not all, and the

Psalmist does not stop here. It is something to be in trouble, and something to be delivered. All this he would describe for the benefit of succeeding generations. But, unlike so many men, he is grateful. His gratitude takes an unmistakeable shape, and he must needs tell the world about this. He tells us what he thinks of God: "Gracious is the Lord and righteous; yea, our God is merciful." He gives us some account of His doings: "The Lord preserveth the simple"—those whose object in life is single, to honour their God. And then he asks how he shall show his gratitude. His question is: "What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits towards me?" It is a pointed and significant question. The Lord hath blessed me, what shall I do in return?

That is the Psalmist's question. It should be ours. Oh, that it were! Is it? We have been abundantly blessed of God. Are we to-day asking what return we can make? Is our language that of the hymn:—

For mercies, countless as the sands,
Which daily I receive
From Jesus, my Redeemer's hands,
My soul, what canst thou give?

Oh, that the Spirit of our God may teach us the worth of the blessings! Rather may He teach us how inestimable is their worth! And may He also teach us our unworthiness! We do not deserve the least of God's many blessings. If we could but know this as we should we should be better able to appreciate the answer. It is a very uncommon answer. Let us look at it for a little while. I venture to say that it is an answer none of us would think of making.

Put it to yourselves. You are sensible of the Lord's mercies, and you ask the Psalmist's question, "What shall I render to the Lord for all His benefits towards me?" What answer would you think of making? Is it not true that this is the last that would occur to you: "I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord." In other words, I will show my gratitude by going to ask Him for other and greater blessings. This, you will say, is a novel way of showing gratitude? Who ever heard of gratitude being expressed in that way before? I have had many blessings from God, and just because of this I will show my gratitude by asking for more blessings. This is something new, surely. No, no, friends, it is nothing new. It is as old as the Bible. God's truth does not develop, as some people would have us think. It is, like Himself, eternal.

Oh, but surely, you will say, there is some mistake about this. The passage must stand alone, and the interpretation is altogether wrong. It cannot be that we show our gratitude to God best by going and asking for more blessings! It must have been very covetous on the part of the Psalmist, the moment he realised the value of his deliverance, to begin and talk about asking further blessings.

He ought rather to have seen how much of his worldly goods he could spare for God's service and glory. That was the way he should have taken to show his gratitude. So we should judge. And yet it was not his way, and it should not be ours. Think of it. What can we give to God that will repay Him?

Alas, from such a heart as mine,
What can I bring Him forth?
My best is stained with sin,
My all is nothing worth.

If we possessed a kingdom, and felt never so grateful, there is nothing that we could give that would serve to repay God for His mercies. We are shut up, therefore, to the method adopted by the Psalmist of expressing our gratitude. His answer must be ours: "I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord."

Yet this acknowledgment I'll make
For all He has bestowed,
Salvation's sacred cup I'll take,
And call upon my God.

But then, you say, we must have further proof from Scripture that this is really the proper way of expressing gratitude to God. What saith the Scripture? "To him that hath, more shall be given." These are the Saviour's words. They do not stand alone. Here again: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name, I will do it." "Ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." The Apostle's words are: "Be careful for nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." Thank God for your past mercies. Show your gratitude by asking for more. That is everywhere the teaching of the Bible.

What then comes of the duty of almsgiving? You say the Saviour plainly enjoins this in the Sermon on the Mount. Amongst other things He says: "Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth." And then in the Acts it is recorded that the angel said to Cornelius, "Thy prayers and thine alms have come up as a memorial before God." This is all true. But almsgiving and showing gratitude to God are not one and the same thing. They are related, as all Christian virtues are, but the one has respect to our neighbour and the other to God. We cannot then, it is quite clear, better express our gratitude than by disposing our hearts for richer and better gifts.

The Psalmist received deliverance, and said he would seek salvation. We have received a harvest, and if we would express our gratitude aright, we should seek further blessings. This would be most pleasing to God. Do we ask what blessings we should seek? The Psalmist had no difficulty. We ought to have none. He said: "I will receive the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord." What blessings are covered by these terms? Just those which we need. These terms are just those which describe the needs of the soul

—life, and that which supports life. We cannot now enter into a full description of them.

Life is better than death. This is always true. The life of the body is better than death. God is the Author and Giver of all life. But the life needs support. God is the Giver of those blessings which continue life. To-day we thank Him for giving us the mercies necessary for our natural life. He might have withheld these blessings. Now the teaching of to-day, as it is the teaching of our text, is that we should show our gratitude by seeking these spiritual blessings. Shall we do so? Shall we determine, by God's help, to fulfil the Saviour's words: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you." Say with the hymn:—

The best return for one like me,
So wretched and so poor,
Is from His gifts to draw a plea,
And ask Him still for more.
I cannot serve Him as I ought,
No works have I to boast;
Yet would I glory in the thought
That I shall owe Him most.

—♦— "JUSTIFICATION."

BY THE REV. J. J. SHERRARD, B.D., INCUMBENT
OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, BANAGHER, DIOCESE
OF MEATH.

SERMON PREACHED IN BANAGHER CHURCH.

"But be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves."—ST. JAMES i. 22.

THIS, I suppose, was one of the sentences in this Epistle which made Martin Luther deny the inspiration of the Apostle St. James. You have all heard the name by which Luther designated this book. He called it an "epistle of straw"; he denied its authority; he refused to believe that it was part of the Bible; he said no Christian could ever have written it, although the proofs of its genuineness and authenticity are as trustworthy as those of any book in the New Testament.

It is easy to see the reason for Luther's dislike of this book. It offended him because it appeared to contradict his favourite doctrine. He disliked it because of its teaching, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

We must make every excuse for Luther's mistake. The age in which he was cast compelled him to run into extremes. In his desperate anxiety to get rid of one error, it was most natural for him to fall into the opposite. Yes, we must not be too hard upon Luther. When it was universally believed throughout the Christian world that Pope and priests had the power of granting indulgences, i.e., of preventing certain consequences following

in the next world on account of sin committed in this; when it was believed that priests had the power of distinguishing exactly how many good works must be performed to satisfy the justice of God; when it was thought that forgiveness of sins could be bought from the Almighty, and the terms and the price of salvation be estimated with the same accuracy as an article you would buy from a shopkeeper, then it was no wonder that Luther's fervent soul should rise in revolt against such blasphemous teaching, no wonder that he laid stress on the old evangelical message of free pardon and grace, no wonder that he insisted on what we all now believe, that men owe their salvation primarily, not to their own works or deservings, but to the mercy and the love of God.

The difficulty, no doubt, with Luther was to reconcile the teaching of St. Paul with that of St. James. But the difference between these two Apostles is easily accounted for. The contradiction, or the apparent contradiction, arises from the fact that each Apostle writes from a different standpoint. St. Paul wrote to correct the mistake of the Jew who did not feel the necessity of any redemption or atonement, except that which each man might work out with God's help for himself. In opposition to this mistake, St. Paul taught that before we could do anything for our own salvation the whole world had to be saved by Christ; that our own righteousness was not enough; that a man could not be saved by law alone; that "as in Adam all had died, so in Christ only could all men be made alive." The persons to whom St. Paul wrote were in spirit still Jews, whose tone was that of the Pharisee: "I am not as other men are; I fast twice in the week, I pay tithes, I keep the law to the minutest details; I can save myself by my own righteousness, by my own good works."

St. James, on the other hand, addressed an entirely different class. He wrote to men who had abused and misunderstood the teaching of St. Paul. He wrote to men who thought their lives and characters were matters of indifference, so long as they believed, so long as they had faith, so long as they trusted in Christ for salvation. It is impossible to read the 2nd chapter of the Epistle of St. James without seeing that this was the mistake he wrote to correct. "What profit is it," says he, "though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith save him? As a tree without fruit is dead, so the man who believes that faith without works will save him is dead also." So it is all through the Epistle. Faith is not enough, says St. James, for the "devils believe and tremble." "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves." "Cleanse your hands and purify your hearts." "Lay aside all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness." "Pure religion and undefiled before God is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world."

Thus, you see, the prime purpose of St. James was not to contradict St. Paul, but to supplement him. St. Paul wrote nothing which St. James would not have assented to. St. James wrote nothing which St. Paul under the same circumstances would not have written also. St. James's object was to teach that, although it is quite true to say that good works do not save a man, yet that it is equally true to say that nobody can be saved without them. His object was to show that, although in one sense it is true that each man is saved by Christ, yet that in another sense each man must "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling," and that it is as impossible for a man to be saved without living a Christian life, as it is for wrong to become right, or for good to become evil.

It is utterly impossible, however, to speak on moral and spiritual subjects with the same accuracy and precision as on mathematical, for in the one case you are dealing with objects which can be measured and counted, while in the other case you are dealing with objects for the most part mysterious, the laws of whose being you can but little understand. The late Bishop of Ossory, who was a distinguished mathematician, wrote a work on the subject I have been speaking of, in which this distinction seems to be ignored. In his book he deals with the most complex of spiritual questions by the rules of mathematics. He quotes and argues from the separate texts of the Bible just as if he was working with mathematical formulas. Trained to clearness of thought, and accustomed to positive demonstrations like all mathematicians, he could not submit to any ambiguities, he could tolerate no unsolved problems. But in moral and spiritual subjects excess of clearness is often purchased only at the price of truth. And so it is in the matter before us.

What is certain is that God requires us to be holy, true men. What is equally certain is that every man that is accepted is so owing to the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ. But when we commence to define accurately and precisely what part man plays in his own justification, and what is due to God, we are met with difficulties on all sides. It is impossible to lay down specific rules, or to give clear explanations.

The Gospel, we know, imposes upon us as a necessity, for any one that wishes to reap its benefits, the formation of a certain character. As far as we can see no one can be saved without that character; and, therefore, no one can be saved without good works, for character is the complex, the combined result of separate acts. But you can no more distinguish the part played by God, and the part played by man in the salvation of a single soul, than you can point out in the growth of our material bodies how much is due to our own exertions, and how much is contributed by the laws and action of nature and our environment. Where

one begins and the other ends is, in both cases, hidden away in insoluble mystery. The paradox is exactly put by St. Paul in the well-known words: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you to will and to do of His good pleasure."

The question whether a man is saved by faith or by works is one which ought never to have been asked at all, for the question implies an impossible alternative. It is just as absurd to talk of a man's possessing faith without works, as it is to talk of the sun's existing without giving light or heat, or for a tree to be alive and yet never to have blossoms, never to have fruit. You can no more separate faith from works than you can distinguish between life and the movements of the body which are the signs of life.

Faith is itself a work; it is the action of a man's whole being, moral, spiritual, and intellectual combined; it is the reaching out of the soul towards God, its Creator and Redeemer; it is the movements of the whole man; it means dependence and trust in God; it means the will and wish to serve and please God.

The spirit which asks how many good works will save my soul is an ignoble and base-born spirit. It is just as if a man's life had been saved by some one, and he were to go to his benefactor and ask, How much do you expect me to give you to prove my gratitude? That is not a very faint representation of the degradation of mind of that man who asks himself seriously how many good works am I to do for God to secure the salvation of my own soul?

CANON WILBERFORCE, accompanied by Mrs. and Miss Wilberforce, starts for India November 8, mainly to study the opium question and the licensed liquor traffic in the country. After November 1 all business letters should be addressed to the Senior Curate, St. Mary's, Southampton.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

Certain HARNESS Cure.

ELECTROPATHIC BELT

FOR
RHEUMATISM

Major PAKENHAM, Longstone House, Armagh, writes:—"The Electropathic Belt has completely cured me of rheumatic gout. I suffered intense agony for two years. I now feel strong and active."

Guaranteed to generate a mild continuous current of Electricity, which speedily cures all Disorders of the Nerves, Stomach, Liver and Kidneys. Thousands of Testimonials. Pamphlet & Advice free on application to Mr. C. B. Harness, Consulting Electrician, the Medical Battery Co. Ltd.

On y Address, **LONDON, W.**
52, OXFORD ST. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
Call to-day, if possible, or write at once

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1889.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS ON HOME REUNION.

THE debate on this subject was opened in a rather transcendental manner by Lord Nelson, who has discovered in St. John's 1st Epistle the great principles of the organisation of the fully-formed Christian community. We should have thought that while in that Epistle St. John says a great deal about Christian sentiment, and a little about Christian doctrine, he never drops a single word about Christian organisation. His lordship also indulges in the pleasing dream that in its first age Christendom was one. Has he never heard of the Ebionites, once a large community, who denied the doctrine, which eventually prevailed, about our Lord's Incarnation? nor of those fellow-Christians who were rejected by the author of the Book of Revelation, as persons who said they were Apostles and were not, but were liars? Or has he ever reflected who was probably the Apostle of Ephesus, to whom John of Patmos applied these bitter words? However, the noble lord writes in the most amiable and Christian-like tone, and, though he points out no definite practical steps that may be taken towards effecting reunion, yet he describes very well the general line of conduct, which, if perseveringly followed on both sides, will lead towards that happy consummation. He says: "The more we relegate points on which we differ to the realm of private opinion, the nearer we shall advance towards unity." Undoubtedly. But amongst the points thus relegated must be the creeds of the fourth century and historic Episcopacy. Then he recommends

"united action on all great moral questions for the benefit of the human race," as, for example, on the subject of peace and war, and an acknowledgment of Christ's work wherever we see it, and general courtesy and kindness towards all who differ from us—recommendations in which all will cordially agree with him.

The next speaker was Dean Perowne, who took (with one important exception) the same position with regard to Episcopacy and Presbytery, as was adopted in a paper in one of our recent numbers. We will quote some of the Dean's words:—

I disclaim in the most emphatic manner any desire to treat Episcopacy as a matter of indifference. I do not think one form of Church government as good as another. I have never uttered a word which, except by gross and wilful perversion, could be made to bear such an interpretation. But I take the ground of our Reformers, I take the ground of our great Anglican divines, and I affirm that Episcopacy is of the *bene esse*, but not of the *esse* of a Church. I believe it to be the best form of government, but I dare not say that without it there is neither Church nor sacrament. I believe its origin may be traced back to Apostolic times. I do not see that it is of Divine command. I believe that Christ may call His ministers now as He called them of old. Paul and Barnabas went forth on their great mission as Christian evangelists before that hands were laid upon them by the officers of the Church. And their ordination, moreover, was not by Apostles, but by the prophets and teachers which were in the Church at Antioch. Shall we say there can be no true ministry apart from Episcopal ordination? Or shall we not rather say with Irenæus, "*Ubi Ecclesia, ibi Spiritus Dei, et ubi Spiritus Dei ibi Ecclesia*"?

The Dean sees that Episcopacy is not a matter of Divine command, and that, in primitive times, ordination was administered sometimes by non-Apostolic hands. Yet he flinches from the necessary consequence of this belief of his that Episcopal ordination cannot be insisted upon as a necessary condition of intercommunion with other churches, for he goes on to say:—

But let me repeat, if I urge concession here I urge it only for the express occasion. I urge it because without this concession reunion is impossible, and because to make this concession for the special end in view is to make no sacrifice of any vital truth. It is to take the position of the Reformers of our own Church before the reformation of the most illustrious of our Anglican divines.

If Episcopacy is, as Dean Perowne admits, not of the essence of the Church because not a Divine command, the concession that he advocates ought to be admitted, not as temporary, but as permanent; and our Presbyterian brethren ought to be recognised frankly and finally as fellow-partakers of the grace of Christ, fellow-members and fellow-ministers of His universal Church.

The Bishop of St. Asaph, who followed, confined his remarks to the Church of Wales, but took occasion, in concluding, to assert and repeat his adherence to the exclusive claims of Episcopacy in these words:—

We will not imperil our old heritage as a part of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, nor will we say one word to recommend or to palliate "the decomposition of Christ's kingdom into a number of sects." . . . We will not imperil the heritage of eighteen centuries in order to

propitiate or conciliate the heresies of to-day and yesterday; but we will make an effort to create a better, a kindlier, and a truer spirit in our relations with our Nonconformist brethren.

But how can this bishop hope to conciliate those whom he speaks of in the same breath "as a number of sects holding the heresies of to-day and yesterday." It is the growth of this arrogant spirit in bishops, and in persons on the road to mitres, which is one of the most discouraging symptoms of our times.

We must include in our notice Mr. Gore's speech in the subsequent debate on the ministry of the Christian Church, as a portion of it belongs to the subject of the reunion of Christendom; and Mr. Gore's treatment of that subject is, though diametrically opposed to our own views, both more thorough and more candid than that of most other speakers. He admits the fact demonstrated by Dr. Lightfoot, that "at a certain stage in the development of the Church the presbyters in each Church constituted the supreme authority over the Church, and all consequently had the power to ordain"; but he insists that it is plain from the Didache "that over them there was a not yet localised order of men of Apostolic and sometimes prophetic dignity to whom would have belonged the power to ordain."

In order to clear our ideas on this point, it is best to take a survey of the state of the congregations for whose use the Didache was compiled, as far as it is made known to us in that document. These congregations consisted entirely of humble people of the working class. They had strong Judaical tendencies, and were wont to appeal to Mosaic commands as still in force. Their local officials were only bishops and deacons, each in plurality, whom they were exhorted to ordain for themselves (*χειροτονήσατε ἑαυτοῖς*). But they received from time to time visits from other Christian personages, of whom three classes are named—Apostles, prophets, teachers, each distinct from the other, although, by a combination of spiritual gifts, one individual might be all the three. These persons seem to have presented themselves as strangers unrecommended, and the churches are directed to test them (*δοκιμάζειν*) before accepting them. No mention is made of any credential to be produced by them from any central or other external authority, such as letters of orders, or "the epistles of commendation," which some of the Corinthians demanded of St. Paul. The sole criterion to be applied to them relates to their teaching and their life. If they are mere travelling missionaries (*ἀπόστολοι*) they are to be sent on the next day, or at latest on the third, with food enough to take them to the next stage, but no money. The journeys are evidently made on foot. If one of them desires to settle, he must be set to work at once, and not permitted to live in idleness. If he prove himself to be a genuine prophet or teacher,

his food may be provided for him by an offering of first-fruits like that prescribed in the Mosaic law (*κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν*) to be given to the priests. If there is no prophet resident, the same offerings must be made to the poor. There were evidently no salaries paid in these communities. Amongst these travelling Christians those who had the gift of prophecy were to be treated with the greatest respect. They were to have (as already mentioned) the high priest's portion of the first-fruits. They were not to be tempted (*πειράζειν*) or separated (*διακρίνειν*) for fear of committing the sin against the Holy Ghost. And at the Eucharist they were to be permitted to depart from the prescribed form, and to use such words of thanksgiving as they pleased. These special privileges they owed, not to any Apostolic ordination, but to their gift of prophecy.

Now Mr. Gore has a theory that these prophetic immigrants were made monarchical bishops of the churches in which they settled, and executed all the ordinations. The theory could only have been revealed to him by some special gift of prophecy of his own, for no trace of it is to be found in the *Didache*. If it be correct, should he not go in for a prophetic rather than an Apostolic succession? And how does he get over the evident fact that the test of a prophet's qualification for office was his works and his utterances, and not his Apostolic credentials?

Altogether, the Church Congress made little progress towards reunion. It displayed much kindly feeling, but no disposition for sectarian self-sacrifice. There was a firm determination on the part of the majority to stick to the assumption that the gifts of God belong to the hierarchy, and not to the *Ecclesia*—the congregation of God. Our hierarchs must humble themselves before they can prepare the way for the Kingdom of Heaven.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

SIR,—Neither the writer of your communicated article of the 31st of August, nor Mr. Ringwood, appears to know what the attitude of the Church of England is towards Presbyterian Orders. For a century after the Reformation Settlement of Elizabeth, ministers of Scotch, Dutch, etc., Orders were capable of holding preferment, of administering the Sacrament, etc. They were considered priests, as they are, for presbyter and priest are the same. By a clause of the Act of Uniformity of 1662 such ministers, on their appointment, have now to be re-ordained. But this necessity to be re-ordained is not the Church's doing, it is the doing of an Act of Parliament; and an Act of Parliament may undo what it has done, without consulting any ecclesiastical person or authority, except the bishops in their capacities as Lords of

Parliament. When, accordingly, your correspondents say that the Church of England does not recognise Presbyterian Orders, they speak without knowledge of the law and the fact.

The usual way that people have of treating this subject (also a great many other subjects) is to assume every point in doubt that makes or seems to make for their notions. I have seldom met with a more thorough instance of this method than the following from Mr. Ringwood:—"The back-bone of the whole argument is, that St. Paul at Ephesus uses the term overseers vaguely with reference to the second order, whereas in his epistles to Timothy and Titus he confines it to the first. But vagueness proves nothing." Here we have the adverb *vaguely* brought in, without a particle of reason that is pretended, or that can be pretended, to qualify the character of bishops ascribed by the Apostle to the elders of Ephesus. And then we are told that the vagueness ascribed without reason to St. Paul's language proves nothing. St. Paul's language is not *vague*, it is what is very different, it is *inclusive*; for if he called the elders bishops, he either meant what he said, or he did not; and although some persons are ready enough to disclaim the meanings of their words, that Apostle was not capable of doing so. Then Mr. Ringwood says that the word bishop, used twice in 1st Timothy, not at all in 2nd Timothy, and once in Titus, applies to the first order of the ministry only. How does he know that it does so? He does not know it contextually from what St. Paul says of bishops, and the manner of men they ought to be. He does not know it from any historical evidence that the differentiation of the two orders, completed afterwards and lasting to the present time, had even begun at A.D. 60. He just assumes it, as thousands more do, and as people in the Middle Ages assumed, that the world was square and the sky hard.

We know that the ultimate shape that the Catholic Church took was the Episcopal shape; in other words, that it developed itself into that shape according to natural progressive social law, as Israel developed itself out of a state of feeble anarchy into a strong monarchy. But at what exact date the differentiation of the ministry into the two orders of bishops and priests, with authority to the former only to ordain and consecrate, commenced, and at what exact date that differentiation was completed, we do not know; nor is the matter anything more than of antiquarian interest considerable, no doubt, in its way. Further, we do not know that any permanent institution of any particular shape, excepting the institution of orders by the imposition of hands, which imposition is the appointed means of transmitting the Holy Ghost, was founded by the Apostles; and, failing our knowledge, we ought to assume that no such institution was founded. In short, while the historical claim for what is understood by the term Diocesan Episcopacy is overwhelming there is no case, except through a series of the most anti-spiritual assumptions for a theocratic Episcopacy; and there is a power on the part of the Church to modify its forms, which power it has always exercised and is exercising, in its sundry branches, now. One extreme exercise of that power by the Church of Scotland occurred in the seventeenth century. I am perfectly ready to admit that I do not think that Church acted wisely when it set up its democratical constitution, while certainly it was placed in a position of great difficulty, and had had many crosses to bear; but what I do not admit is, that the Church of Scotland became un-Catholic by adopting

the system of parity among its ministers. One of your correspondents says, rather petulantly, that what the Queen does is no rule to us. I do not remember that it was said that it is. But the Queen's acts, if not a rule, may be an excellent example; and I do think that that Royal lady, by frequenting the services of the lawful and Apostolically-descended Church of Scotland when she is in Scotland, and by eschewing those of the Dissenting sect called the Scotch Episcopal Church, is giving a good example to her subjects.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

12th October, 1889.

SIR,—Mr. Rawstone's very able article on this subject, which appeared in the PULPIT of the 28th September, deserves more consideration than it received from your clerical correspondents. I have been looking out for some response to it, but none appears, and therefore I venture to direct attention to the subject of it—The Reunion of Christendom—that is, I presume, Mr. Rawstone means *Protestant* Christendom is a consummation devoutly to be wished. It is what true Christians of every section of the Church of Christ earnestly pray for, and it is what might be brought about if men would give up their prejudices, their little shibboleths, and their pride, and allow the love of God to fill their hearts. That is what we all need, both laymen and clergymen, more and more of the love of God shed abroad in our hearts, and then we shall be less ready to pick holes in the clerical vestments or Church organisations of those who differ from us in externals. If we take our stand on the one foundation Christ Jesus, and let the word of God be our rule of faith, we can leave Church orders and creeds and sacraments to be determined by each Christian community as to it may seem most in accord with its own interpretation of Scripture, or with its circumstances. And then if all would agree to an interchange of pulpits, the Presbyterian and Methodist and Congregationalist conforming to the Episcopal service when he preaches in the Church, and the Episcopalian conforming to the chapel service when he preaches therein, we should soon forget our differences, and would feel ourselves, whether in church or chapel, children of the same family, sheep of the same fold, and co-workers with Christ Jesus. Then laymen might be admitted to take part in the services and activities of the Church more than they are permitted to do at present. There are many in our churches who would be glad to do this, but by custom are precluded from it, and this preclusion is injurious to the spiritual life of the Church, and very often to the growth in grace of the man himself. Did our bishops realise this as we laymen realise it, I think they would see their way to alter it. God grant that something may be done to bring about a union of Christians, and a development of spiritual power throughout the world.

JOHN A. WALKER.

Dublin.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SIR,—Will you allow me to defend myself from the criticism of "C. P.M." in your number for this week, October 5th?

I do not say that there was any compact between Broad and Low in the Irish Synod to emasculate either the Baptismal services or the Athanasian Creed. How can any one know anything of secret compacts? All I said, and say, is that the Evangelicals, holding the necessity of "believing rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ," helped the Broad party to strike it out of the Creed. Who doubts this? Let him read the votes. I have them before me. As to the Baptismal grace, the Broad party, knowing well that Regeneration in the services could not possibly mean Conversion, yet, as if it did, helped the Evangelicals in their attempt to introduce an alternative Baptismal service, which would nullify what the Catechism says, viz, that "we are hereby made children of grace." There is no use in introducing names of either the living or the dead. "I accept no man's person," as St. Paul said.

The theory of those who deny "the necessity of believing rightly" is this, that we are not answerable for our belief. But our Lord says the contrary, "Except ye believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins" (John viii. 24,) and again, "He hath made God a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son" (1 John v. 10.) It is at our peril that we reject what is sufficiently made plain to us by God.

C. C., V.-G.

CHURCHMEN IN COUNCIL.

SIR,—Cambridge men are credited with starting from *definitions*. I have lived in hope deferred as to Dean Perowne's definition of the "maximum and minimum" of the three Churchmen's Comprehensive Scheme. The Church Congress has met and dispersed at Cardiff. At one of the Cardiff churches the Bishop of Derry was the preacher. To use common words, he was "let in" for what, I am quite sure, that eloquent and devout churchman viewed as the "maximum," and not the "minimum" of comprehension. My writing may read to some as flippant. There is nothing further from my thoughts. When will our clergy see the great responsibility of guiding men as clergy supposed to be able to be guides, and take a *judicial* view of their responsibility. We have before us as clergy and laity curious samples of the *unjudicious* mind in the clergy. Let us put bishops first of course, because bishops are our Ordinaries in respecting their oaths of allegiance to our God supreme, to the "Powers that be." Is the Bishop true to oaths? Then comes deans. An able man and true joins with brethren in the faith to unite men, all representative, and opposed to bring about "comprehension." Thus three worthy Churchmen put forth their scheme of union, and without any definitions. What does it amount to? Simply "Q. E. D.," and no diagram or exact reasoning to help their readers to form a right judgment. Another scheme is propounded. A "full man," an archdeacon and a ripe scholar, an earnest man. A hasty writer, though effective preacher, puts for his idea of meeting "the wants of the age." The stupid public see a hornet's nest in his proposals. Then he has to write apologetically that "his views are misunderstood." A Southampton curate sees his opportunity, and comes out in print unmistakably. Then the Archdeacon is driven into a corner—"Wait and see what you will see; wait and see what Convocation propounds."

Now, sir, let us put aside all badinage. What we

clergy really stand in need of is a daily use of the collect for Whit-Sunday; and then, trying to see the value of the lawyer's dictum—"Look all round," weigh in the balances, and don't be found wanting as to the whole Church of Englishmen, and the Englishman's wish to go straight.

NEMO.

October 7th, 1889.

DIVINE INFLUENCES TRANSFORMING HUMAN CHARACTER.

SIR,—I see from Mr. Donaldson's letter in the PULPIT of 28th September that he has entirely misconceived the nature of my argument. It seemed to me clearly stated, and I was fortified by the approbation of two clergymen, on whose judgment I rely, and to whom I submitted my observations. I regret to observe the same acrimonious tone as before, and a tendency to impute unworthy motives. I suppose such feelings are unavoidable on the part of those who have persuaded themselves that a man who says the Bible does not sanction the doctrine of endless sin and misery virtually attacks the fundamental principles of Christianity.

In reply to one of the incorrect declarations of Mr. Donaldson, I never said that God "will put no punishment at all upon sin." I have frequently asserted the contrary in my communications to the PULPIT, and did so in those which appeared on 24th and 31st August. No one is more convinced than I am that sin is punished severely, both in this life and the next. But at the same time I hold the blessed and happy belief that the Bible reveals the grand purpose of God to deliver all His creatures from sin and misery, and that the Scheme of Redemption, through Christ, contains abundant resources for the accomplishment of that purpose.

Mr. Donaldson quotes the text 2 Thess. i. 9: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." I see the word is rendered "eternal" in the Revised Version, and in the Vulgate "*pænas eternas*." The original word is "*aiônion*" which, whether adjective or substantive, never means endless, as is shown by Archdeacon Farrar in "Mercy and Judgment," chap. xiii. A friend of mine, a layman, who is, I believe, a good Greek scholar, says, in a book printed for private circulation, that "*o lethrôn aiônion*," the words in this passage, rendered "everlasting destruction," really means "age-long destruction." He adds the following remarks: "Plato used *aiônios* as the antithesis of endless. Gregory of Nyssa (a Greek) speaks of an *aiônion* interval." *Aiônios* therefore does not, and never did, mean "endless." Another friend, also a layman, who has studied Greek, renders the words *o lethrôn aiônion* as really meaning *age lasting destruction*, and adds "the last a most ambiguous word, and translated in a dozen different ways."

Mr. Donaldson says that Christ first enunciated the doctrine of everlasting punishment. This I beg to deny, and will now refer to one of the passages, on which the holders of that doctrine seem chiefly to rely in support of it. I mean Matt. xxv. 46, where *Kolasís aiônion* is rendered *everlasting punishment* in the Authorised Version. In the book of the lay friend to whom I referred, the real sense is stated to be *age long remedial punishment*, as the word *Kolasís* (punishment) means originally pruning, which is distinctly a reme-

dial process. If vindictive punishment were intended, the Greek word would be *timoria*. The interpretation which Dr. Farrar gives to this passage in "Mercy and Judgment," ch. xv., is substantially the same as the foregoing. Dean Plumptre, in his book "Spirits in Prison," ch. xiv., says, "The *aiônion* chastisement (*Kolasís*) implies a punishment for the sake of the sufferers."

I submit these remarks to those who are willing to consider the opinions of persons differing from themselves in a candid and kindly spirit.

J. B.

Canonbury, October 5th, 1889.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—It is much to be regretted when religious controversy takes the form of a personal altercation, but as Mr. Donaldson, in his letter published in the PULPIT of the 5th October, has put what he regards as a defence of religious truth into the form of an attack on me, I must request leave to reply. It was only accident that prevented me from doing so a week earlier.

I do not admit defeat and failure when I say that the doctrine of a final restoration cannot be demonstrated. What I said was that no truth belonging to the spiritual order can be demonstrated, and therefore demonstration in such matters ought not to be asked for. As Matthew Arnold has admirably said, "Truth is not to be proved, but to be seen."

Mr. Donaldson says that when St. Paul prophecies that "all Israel shall be saved" (Romans xi. 26), he only means all those Israelites who shall be living when "the Deliverer shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." This appears a very strained interpretation, especially when we read in the 32nd verse, "God hath shut up all unto unbelief [in the Revised Version, *disobedience*] that He might have mercy upon all."

Mr. Donaldson says I misquote St. Paul in attributing to him the saying that all enemies shall be abolished. The Apostle's words are these (Revised Version)—"He shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death." If this does not mean that all enemies are to be abolished, St. Paul is more careless in the use of words than I can believe him to be. And in such a context death must mean the sum total and the consequences of sin.

Mr. Donaldson says, "It is not said that Christ took upon Him the form of a bond-servant, but rather the form of a servant." The Revised Version has—"Who, being originally in the form of God, counted it not a thing to be grasped to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant" (Philippians ii. 6, 7). I have quoted the marginal readings. A glance at the Greek will show that "bond-servant," or "slave," is right. It is impossible that Mr. Donaldson can have wilfully misquoted Scripture, but he evidently has no copy of the Revised Testament, and has lent his Greek Testament to a friend.

I do believe that "the very and eternal God took man's nature." But in writing about the treatment of the Athanasian Creed in the Church of Ireland, in the PULPIT of the 24th August, I carefully kept to historical statements, and expressed no opinions of

my own. I do not think the authority of the Athanasian Creed is on the same level with that of the other two creeds, and I do not believe in the damnatory clauses in any sense whatever.

Finally, as to "Mahomedan theology." Anyone who reads my letter in the PULPIT of 14th September might see that I do not apply that expression to a text of St. Paul's, but to Mr. Donaldson's way of using the text. I call myself Evangelical, and I regard it as a commonplace of Evangelical theology that God did not save the world by mere omnipotence. Were it so there would be no need or place for the atonement. Mahomedans believe that there is nothing better than mere omnipotence, and that holiness consists in power, and they, with perfect consistency, deny an atonement.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 14th October, 1889.

WE regret to state that, in obedience to imperative orders, Canon Body is leaving England for Florence for two months. Owing to the responsibility which the Canon has incurred in his self-sacrificing and indefatigable efforts among the labouring population of the county of Durham, his enforced absence from England has caused him personal anxiety. A large staff of Mission workers (forty-one) are engaged in the diocese under his direction, and it is hoped that the liberality of those who know and appreciate his services will relieve him from this anxiety. Freed from this burden, we trust Canon Body's recovery may be more rapid and complete. In consequence of his departure, his place as a speaker at the Durham Diocesan Conference was taken by Bishop Sandford.

SENSATIONAL TITLES FOR SERMONS.—In his second lecture on "Modern Puffing," delivered in Dublin recently by Chancellor Tisdall, the following passage occurs:—"Catchpenny titles are by no means peculiar to works of a secular kind. They are prefixed to sermons, and to lectures on religious subjects. 'How Rags are made into Paper, and how Sinners are made into Christians,' is the title of an address delivered a few days ago in this city. No language which I have the power to use is adequate for the full expression of my disgust at the adoption of such a title. In a publication of which I receive copies from time to time, I find, among the sensational headings of discourses by a popular American preacher: 'Paul in a Basket'; 'The Boy come Home'; 'Up and Down'; 'A Great Woman.' In two volumes by the same preacher the following appear: 'Gospel Archery'; 'Hard Rowing'; 'Christian Handshaking'; 'Torches Lighted'; 'A Chime of Bells'; 'Fowl of Every Kind'; 'Furious Driving'; 'The Owl, the Bat, the Vulture, the Chameleon, and the Snail.' The advice given by Hamlet to the players might, I think, have parts of its structure thus adapted to suit the case of each sensational preacher of that class: 'Let your own discretion be your tutor. Suit the title to the subject, with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of reverence, for anything so overdone is from the purpose of preaching; and though it makes the lovers of the sensational stare, cannot but make the sober-minded grieve, the censure of which one should, in your allowance, overweigh a whole tabernacle of others.' 'Enthusiasm must be progressive, or it will expire.' These forcible words,

penned by Sidney Smith (an uncompromising enemy of all hypocritical pretences), when the present century was but eight years old, are certainly well worth the serious consideration of those who resort to low artifices, which minister to a taste for the sensational. The puffing mountebank pulpiteer may

Play such tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.

For he may be guilty of a quaintness and comicality which amount to irreverence, and profanely use his place of ministration as an excuse for the display of his buffooning."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Baily, Rev. Johnson, M.A., Vicar of South Shields, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon in Durham Cathedral.
Carter, Rev. Edward Hobhouse Proctor, Curate of St. Michael's, Camden Town; Vicar of Christ Church, Monmouthshire.
Deacon, Rev. Alfred E., M.A., Curate of St. Simon's, West Kensington Park; Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for St. Alban's Diocese.
Douglas, Rev. William E., Curate of Carleton, near Skipton; Chaplain at Bangalore, India.
Dowling, Rev. Theodore Edward, late Rector of Christ Church, St. Stephen's, New Brunswick, Canada; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem and the East.
Edwards, Rev. L. C., M.A., Vicar of Kingsbury, Middlesex; Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Ajaccio, Corsica, for the winter season of 1889-90.
Eliot, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of Aston; Honorary Canon in Worcester Cathedral.
Franklyn, Rev. T. E., Old Dalby Hall, Vicar of the Donative of Old Dalby.
Hall, Rev. Edwin Vine, M.A., Precentor of Worcester Cathedral; Vicar of Bromsgrove.
Hayne, Rev. R. J., M.A., Vicar of Buckland Monachorum, Devon; Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral.
Mills, Rev. J. W., M.A., Rector of St. George's, Birmingham; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.
Milne, Rev. Percy Henry, M.A., Rector of Evershot-with-Frome St. Quintin, Dorset.
Moor, Rev. C., M.A., Vicar of Barton-on-Humber.
Nash, E. J., M.A., Minor Canon in Rochester Cathedral.
Northcote, Hon. and Rev. John Stafford, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Victoria Street, Westminster.
Quirk, Rev. Canon, Vicar of Rotherham; Vicar of St. Mary-with-St. Nicholas, Beverley.
Richardson, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Rhyl, and Vicar-elect of Northop, Flintshire; Canon in St. Asaph Cathedral.
Row, Rev. Arthur William Septimus Albert, M.A., Vicar of West Drayton, Middlesex.
Sketchley, Rev. Horatio Powys, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Salisbury; Curate-in-Charge of Bradford Peverell, Dorset.
Thiselton, Rev. A. C., Chaplain of Berwick, Shrewsbury; Chaplain of Trinity Church, Rome.
Waugh, Rev. James Hay, M.A., Curate of St. Catherine's, Gloucester; Minor Canon in Worcester Cathedral.
Wright, Rev. Arthur C., M.A., R.N., Chaplain and Naval Instructor on the Retired List; Curate of St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, W.
Wyatt, Rev. G. D., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Highbury; Rector of Bermondsey.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Barton, Rev. Gerard, of Fundenhall Grange, at Kirkley Cliff, Lowestoft, on the 7th inst., aged 55.
Bigland, Rev. J. E., at Wickenby Rectory, on the 8th inst., aged 61.
Seaborn, Rev. Hugh Saunderson, at Gunningbland Station, New South Wales, on August 27, aged 80.



The Church of England Pulpit.

JEHU AND ELIJAH.—FALSE AND TRUE ZEAL.

BY THE REV. CANON RAWSTORNE, M.A.

"Come with me, and see my zeal for the Lord."—
2 KINGS x. 16.

"I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts."—
1 KINGS xix. 10.

THESE two sayings are very much alike; but they were spoken by two very different men; the first by Jehu, king of Israel; the second by Elijah, the great prophet of the Lord. The two men form a remarkable contrast; and their few striking resemblances, and many striking differences, will afford us an opportunity of studying two qualities, of which each is an example, true zeal and false zeal.

Elijah and Jehu were men of the same generation, but Elijah considerably the older of the two. While Jehu was riding as a subordinate officer in King Ahab's body-guard, he heard Elijah speak, in Naboth's vineyard, his stern denunciation of that wicked king; and the prophet had already departed in his fiery chariot before his successor Elisha had anointed Jehu king over Israel. They were both on the same side in religion and in politics. The great religious controversy of those days was between Baal and Jehovah—Baal, the material nature-god, with a worship sensuous and immoral, and Jehovah, the God above nature, Creator of the universe, with a worship spiritual, pure, and holy. And the political question was one of foreign policy, between an alliance with Tyre and Sidon, the homes of luxury, immorality, and Baal-worship; and one with Jerusalem, the seat of the house of David, and the centre of the worship of the thrice-holy Jehovah. The religious and political questions were so closely allied that they could not be separated in any mind.

Both Elijah and Jehu had been educated in the faith of Jehovah, and pledged by the names given them on their admission into covenant with their God to Jehovah's side in the great controversy of the age. Elijah's name means, My God is Jehovah; while that of Jehu may be translated, Jehovah is He. Of those memorable words which the people shouted on Mount Carmel, when their hearts were for a moment turned back again to the true God—"Jehovah He is the God," the two first, contracted a little so as to form an appellative name, are Jehu's name—Jehovah—He. Here then were two children, started in early life

on the same road, initiated into the same faith, with the same confession, their faith and their confession being embodied for each in his very name; and each, though in a different fashion, held that faith till his death, and expressed his religious convictions in the same identical words. "I have been very jealous for Jehovah God of hosts," said Elijah. "Come with me, and see my zeal for Jehovah," said Jehu. Zealous and jealous, zeal and jealousy, seem to have meant the same thing to our translators of the Bible; at least, they represent the same Hebrew words.

And now, having noted the resemblances between these two characters, let us proceed to observe the differences. Elijah had passed his youth in the prophets' schools, an institution as ancient as the days of Samuel. The life in these was studious, contemplative, and retired, and ascetic, although not celibate. The prophet, or prophet's son (as their scholars were called) wore the cloak of camel's hair, and the leathern girdle about the loins, such as were afterwards worn by the last of the Hebrew prophets, John the Baptist. There Elijah had studied the law of Moses, and had sung (for he was one over whose spirit music had great power) the psalms of David, the sweet psalmist of Israel; there he had read whatever other stores of varied learning had been left by King Solomon, and other wise men and seers, who had lived in earlier days. There, far from that religious ceremonial, which is always the hand-maid of idolatry, he had learnt to feel God near, and to hear His voice. His great bold spirit, fed on wholesome spiritual food, had grown stronger and stronger in his childhood's faith; while a temperate life had given him a strong athletic body, able, on an occasion, to run with loins girded before Ahab's chariot to the entering-in of Jezreel. For himself he aspired after nothing worldly; but, whenever a sin was committed, whether by prince or people, he was utterly undaunted in his faithful reproof. Nor had his severe life deadened and killed the softer and gentler side of his great character. We may see him at home in the widow's family partaking of their bread and cup, and obtaining for them, by his prayers, the food that they needed in the time of famine; and then, soon afterwards, stricken to the heart, when the widow's son dies, and she, in the bitterness of her sorrow, lays her affliction at his door; and turning to God in deep distress, "O Jehovah, my God, hast thou also brought evil upon the widow with whom I sojourn by slaying her son." And always we see him deeply feeling the loneliness to which he has been condemned, and often praying that he may die. "It is enough, now, O Lord, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers." So he went through life, a stern heart, yet full of tenderness; a strong heart, yet with many an hour of sinking weakness; but, whether weak or strong, whether hopeful or despairing, still constant to his youthful faith and

confession, still living out his name, Eli-Jah, My God is Jehovah.

Let us now take the other side of the parallel — General, or as he afterwards became, King Jehu. We have seen already that he was dedicated to Jehovah in his infancy, and that his parents must have desired, so far as the naming of him could have that effect, to fix him for life on Jehovah's side. So he grew up to manhood with his own name every day reminding him that not Baal, but Jehovah, is He; just as to us, who have had a Christian education, every reminiscence of childhood, every unforbidden lesson, reminds us of our faith and our obligations. He was brought up to be a soldier, and no doubt the moral atmosphere of the barrack was not as wholesome as that of the prophet's school. But there was nothing in that matter of profession which could account for the difference between the two men. The military profession is one that is by no means unfavourably regarded in Holy Scripture, which is far the most severe upon the clerical one. All the centurions in the New Testament, five in number, receive honourable mention from the sacred writers. An officer, even in the army of Ahab, might have lived out the faith of his childhood as truly as Elijah did. We only know one incident of his early career. On that memorable day, when Ahab rode down to Naboth's vineyard to take possession of it, Jehu was in the escort that followed him, and there heard the awful words, "Where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, there shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine." His personal character had two sides, which seem most contrary, yet often have been combined in the same person—much caution and craft in the choice of an object, and of the means of attaining it, and then, when that object has been chosen, and the way to it is clearly seen, passionate eagerness in pursuit of it. When the young prophet had anointed him in the secret chamber, he concealed the incident until he had sounded the disposition of his officers. As soon as he had discovered that they would go with him, he took his resolution at once, and went straight at his object, driving furiously, or, as it is literally, driving like a madman towards his aim. His zeal for Jehovah, which seems to have been suppressed in Ahab's reign, and also in that of Ahab's son, now blazed forth. He massacred Ahab's family, killed Jezebel, and destroyed that worship of Baal, which was according to the creed of the party opposed to his own. But he left Jeroboam's two golden calves standing, because their worship helped to maintain the separate national life of the ten tribes of Israel, and thus to support his own throne.

I do not think that his zeal was entirely insincere. He had been brought up a worshipper of Jehovah, and men generally do believe in the religion in which they have been brought up, especially if they are men of action, and belong to the non-literary classes. But he had been a very luke-

warm believer, and had shown no zeal at all, until he found all at once that zealous adherence to his childhood's faith would be a stepping-stone to power.

We may find many instances in history ancient, modern, and contemporary, of a sudden incandescence of fiery zeal for truth and justice, or for humanity, exactly coinciding with an opportunity presented of ascending to power or of acquiring popularity. Cases such as these are difficult subjects of moral analysis. They make us wonder whether the new-made zealot ever pauses to analyse himself, as Jehu certainly did not. We think, Does the political zealot, or the still more fiery religious partisan, ever put to himself such questions as these? How much of this heat of mine is true zeal for God or for humanity? how much personal ambition, self-interest, vanity? how much sincerity, and how much self-deception. Moralists cannot, unfortunately, analyse human souls, as chemists do bodies. Only, it may be said, that in most paroxysms of burning zeal, without the mixture of personal motive, the explosion would never have taken place at all. It certainly never would in the case of Jehu, for it did not until the opportunity of personal aggrandisement arose.

We have now materials before us out of which to construct a few practical sentences upon zeal—zeal false and zeal true.

First of all let us remark that zeal is, in itself, a good thing—a noble quality, far above lukewarmness, far above indifference. Paul said, "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing," and none knew better than he the quality which he praised. The writer of the Book of Revelation, speaking in his Master's name, expresses the strongest disgust at the opposite quality of lukewarmness. And our Saviour's disciples took note that in his disposition the Psalmist's words had been fulfilled—"The zeal of thine house hath even eaten me."

It is good to be zealous. Zeal is the fire of the human heart, which may indeed break loose from bounds and cause a conflagration; but without it there is no energy, no movement, no fervour, no life, no noble deeds. There is good and evil in zeal; but there is nothing but evil in lukewarmness and indifference. And let us not forget—indifference, or the affectation of indifference, is the prevailing fault of our own times. It is good to be zealous, only we must learn to distinguish between the false zeal and the true.

What are the characteristics?

True zeal, like Elijah's, waits and labours and perseveres, fails or succeeds, suffers or triumphs—always the same, in fashion or out of fashion, alone or with a multitude, in success or in failure, in victory or in defeat, in hope or in despondency, because it has no selfish object, and because it believes its own aim to be according to the will of God.

False zeal, like Jehu's, only kindles when a hope appears of some earthly prize. To climb to a throne or to a high office in Church or State, to secure the success of a party, political or religious, of which one imagines oneself to be an ornament, if one be a great man; to gain any little post or trumpety distinction, if one be a small one—such are the aims which draw from men a sham enthusiasm in favour of the cause which seems to tend to their own advancement. False zeal seeks its own, and serves its idol, whether that idol be wealth, or distinction, or party success and power.

Again, true zeal, like Elijah's, is always zeal for godliness and virtue. He was indeed zealous, also, on the controversial issue between Jehovah and Baal. But he was also equally zealous on the moral issue between the wronged and murdered Nabal and his oppressors and murderers. False zeal, like Jehu's, is untinged with the higher zeal for virtue and godliness. It can destroy Baal, if his destruction subserves its own interest, and for that purpose it can use every weapon of violence and dissimulation. But it departs not from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, which are profitable and politic; it never thinks of sacrificing its own ambitions or immoralities.

Suppose, now, these tests were applied to the heroes of our age—to the popular demagogues, the political leaders, the wire-pullers of parties, the redressers of grievances, the saviours of society, the pretenders to royalty, or even to the leaders of religious movements, the prominent ecclesiastics, the popular preachers, the eminent teachers and hierophants of the day—what a mixture of the false and the true would be found in the analysis of each and all! But our concern is to apply the tests to ourselves. If we are hot about anything, zealous for any cause, is the heat generated by a holy or unholy fire? Are we zealous for Jehovah really, or only for ourselves? This is a case in which the greatest amount of self-deception is possible. I daresay that many of us, as we read in the newspapers the speeches of some of the ambitious enthusiasts, wonder whether they are consciously deceiving the public as to their motives, or whether they have first completely deceived themselves. We are all of us liable to the same self-deception, and the greater the zeal, the greater is the danger of that self-deceit which is the constant companion of enthusiasm.

There is evidently a caution required, and that caution is conveyed very beautifully in a comment on this story of Elijah, which I have read in some author whose name I cannot now remember; but I think the comment belongs to one of the early fathers, and, as it is certainly not my own, I may venture to say that I think the idea which it contains is a beautiful one.

True zeal, if it would continue true, must often retire from Mount Carmel, from the presence of the multitude, from the scene of its triumphs, from

the midst of its popularity, from the indulgence of its love of power, from the society of its fellow-partisans, to Horeb, the Mount of God, to quiet, silent solitude, to the home of the Ten Commandments, to the place where the still small voice of the Spirit breathes. There it must get to be alone, detached from all the earthly influences which swarm so thickly round it. There it must compare its actions with God's moral law. There it must seek to have its motives purified by the breath of God's Holy Spirit; and it must humbly ask for a higher judgment upon the actions, which the inward fire of the heart has excited it to do. It must come to the light, that its deeds may be manifested, whether they have been wrought in God or no.

False zeal has no such calm, searching self-inspections. It waves its flag, puts on its colour, mounts its stump, shouts its party cry, shuts its eyes, and then either leads, or follows a leader, to the self-chosen aim.

And now let us bring this lesson home.

Some of us here present may be zealous for certain aims, religious or political; and the aims or directions of different minds may be very different. But these two texts, and the two human lives out of the midst of which they came, will furnish a lesson to all. Let us set the two before ourselves once more.

I will not tell you to say, like Jehu, "Come with me and see my zeal for Jehovah." No; show your zeal to none. Do not exhibit it either in writing, or in oratory, or in conversation. Ask no one to see it. Be a good deal suspicious of it yourself, knowing how apt all zeal is to contract earthly mixtures.

But retire often, like Elijah, to Sinai, the Mount of God, the birth-place of God's commandments. Take with you those aims and efforts of yours which seem to be religious or philanthropic, those aims which you would fain persuade others, which you would fain think yourself to be for God. Compare all these with the word of truth and with the law of charity. Dissect and analyse them all, and refer what you discover to the Searcher of hearts, and then wait till that wind, which breatheth where it will, and breathes most freely over the desert hills of quiet retirements, breathe its purifying influence on your zeal.

Take up the word, "I have been very jealous for Jehovah, God of hosts." Is it so? Has all my zeal, my fervour, my earnestness, my deepest interest, been for Him, and not for myself at all? These stirrings of my heart, these activities of my life, these outpourings of my lips, do they really take place because I think that God wants them done, and calls me to be His instrument in doing them? Is there no strange fire mixed with my holy fire, no selfishness combined with my zeal?

This is the sort of search which does good if it be done honestly. And the result of it will ever be

the discovery of a great deal of false zeal, and the toning down of hearts, not, I trust, to lukewarmness and indifference, but to aims and activities much nearer to the way and will of God, than those which are talked about and quarrelled about in the world. We shall be led to be zealous—even very zealous—but only for Jehovah, the God of Truth, of Holiness, of Love; and for such things as come from Him, and will bear His examination—things true, and holy, and pervaded throughout with the spirit of Christian love.

THE HOLY ANGELS.

BY THE REV. W. DONE BUSHELL, M.A., ASSISTANT MASTER IN HARROW SCHOOL.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE SCHOOL CHAPEL, HARROW, ON MICHAELMAS DAY, 1889.

“And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him.”—GENESIS xxxii. 1.

AND not for the first time. You doubtless will remember how the patriarch as he fled from Esau's anger into Haran, “lighted,” it is said, “upon a certain place, and tarried there all night because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed, and, behold, a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and, behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it.”

And now once more, returning into the power of Esau after the lapse of many years, the record tells us all too briefly that as he “went on his way the Angels of God met him.”

Do they meet us? Whether at crises of our lives or in our daily work, does any recognition of an angelic ministry come to us? I fear but seldom. No doubt the thought of angel guardianship and angel help is full of poetry, but so is the thought of fairy or of dryad. You can yourselves best judge if I am wrong in fearing that to many minds the holy angels are but little more than they?

And if so, why is it? One reason (to be just) is this: with not a few good men the central doctrine of the Atonement, and the forgiveness of our sins by the blood of Jesus Christ, is of such transcendent urgency as to obscure almost all other no less real though less important articles of faith. And so they lose their hold on even the great truth of the Communion of all Saints in love and prayer and spiritual agency. For what I say is true, unfortunately, not of angels only, but of the saintly dead. In our communion with the spiritual world, such as it is, we feel, I trust, that we are dealing with a personal and loving Father, and with an Eternal Son who has redeemed and saves us daily by His intercession; but am I wrong in saying that there we often end, that even of the Holy Spirit of God

as of One who loves and helps us, we have often far too little thought; and that of those who have passed behind the veil, and help us doubtless by their prayers, and maybe in a thousand other ways we know not of, from her who was the Mother of God to the last-loved one whom we lost but yesterday, of them we take but little account? And so our faith grows often far more cold and cheerless than it should be, and we fail to enter on our full Catholic inheritance, we do not understand that we are come “unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels”;—*are* come, and not *shall* come.

Now this, of course, is not the Church's fault. To-day we are reminded of the Holy Angels, and in a few weeks there will come to us All Saints' Day, the very Field-day of the Church; and, if you will, there is All Souls' Day. Nay, every month we are bidden to turn our thoughts to one or other of the saints, and that not merely I suppose that we may gain some help by the example of their earthly lives, for of those lives we often know but very little, but that we may draw near to them in spirit, and claim their care and help with God.

But what we are dealing with to-day is the Angelic Ministry. Now, surely, we must admit at once that there is nothing in itself more probable than the existence of such holy beings. Is there no world except the world we see? And if there is, is there an unbridged chasm between man and God? Can any one who for a moment thinks on the immeasurable universe, itself but the expression of unknown agencies, believe that man, great as he is, has naught above him in the vast scale of being? Can any one who for a moment thinks upon the continuity of life, how from the coral or the zoophyte, through insect, fish, bird, beast, we come to man, man with his power to organise, man with his power to pray, man with his power to recognise the supreme law of self-sacrifice, believe that there is there a harsh discontinuity? Is it not far more probable at least that gifts like these, man's highest and characteristic gifts, are but the lowest manifestations of a far-reaching order of which indeed we know but little yet, but which is none the less, so far as we may know it or conjecture it with probability, a fitting field of exercise for trust and gratitude and hope? No, we may not depopulate the heavenly places, except to our own loss, and to the loss of truth.

But it is said or thought that, granting such a probability, or at least such possibility, we have no evidence that bright and blessed beings like these have contact with us, or at least have no such evidence as may impel us to turn naturally to them as our friends and helpers in our need. Well, if this were so, faith might well be wise to venture something even beyond what is explicitly revealed. But is this so? The witness of the Church as we have seen is clear; so also is the witness of the

Bible, so also is the witness of the great Masters of the Divine Life.

What is the witness of the Bible? Surely I need not dwell on that, need not remind you how as the old man sat at his tent door three angels came to speak to him; need not remind you how the simple-hearted soldier lifts his eyes and sees the Captain of the Lord's Host standing in his way; surely I need not speak of Balaam and of Hagar, of Gideon and of Manoah, of Zacharias and of Mary, how they met face to face the angels of the Eternal One with messages from heaven; need not recall the vision of the shepherds, or of the seer in Patmos. No, these are tales we learned and loved when we were children. But I desire to be quite candid, and I will therefore freely own that even such witness often does not seem to satisfy; men say to themselves that they do not see angels now, and that these fair bright visions after all are not the outcome of the world's maturer wisdom, but the poetic dreams of childhood; that we have risen through illusion to the truth, albeit the cheerless truth, that they are visions only, and are but the offspring of the young imagination which itself created them. Ours is the sad and sober estimate of middle age, and we must put away from us the bright but unsubstantial dreams of youth.

Well, an analogy is but a very inconclusive argument at best; but let us accept it for what it is worth, and let us boldly ask if we indeed are sure that age is right and youth is wrong. Age has its gains; it has its losses also. Do not believe you must grow good as you grow old. It is the young men who "see visions and dream dreams," but that was not said in depreciation of such gifts. It is upon the children that the Spirit is poured forth; it is from the mouth of babes and sucklings that God often perfects praise; that is to say, that youth has powers of enterprise and of enthusiasm and of self-surrender, of entering therefore very deeply into the things of God if it would only rise to its high calling, which in our later years have often passed away from us, or, if by God's great mercy they remain, have been transmuted into other forms, though not, it well may be, into anything more Divine.

And, therefore, we may accept the analogy, and may yet appeal from the world's age to the world's youth. Grant if you will that age must take a different view to that of youth; grant for example if you will that we cannot now conceive of the Eternal One who framed the immeasurable universe and reigns over the myriad worlds as men conceived of One who led forth Israel to war enthroned in visible Shekinah on the mercy seat; grant in like manner that the angels do not meet us visibly with loving word and shining wing, yet surely you must also grant that as God is not less but more to us than was Jehovah to the Israelites, so in like manner we should recognise with even more of gratitude, of love, of awe, the Ministry of

Angels, just as in proportion as we recognise more fully than did the men of old the vastness of the works of God, and therefore of their sphere of ministry. To put the matter plainly, we need lay but little stress upon the form in which these old world stories of God's angel messengers have come to us; it well may be that they speak the language of a more childlike age than ours, more realistic and less critical; and yet that after all the voice of childhood may, in its illusions, tell us more of heaven than does the sober common sense of later life.

Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory, do we come
From God, who is our home:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy.

And may not that which seemed to Wordsworth to be true of children, be true also of the childhood of the human race?

One other question we will ask. What is the witness of the great Masters of the Divine Life? And since the time is short, let it suffice to say they follow Christ. And let us ask what it is He says? Of this, at least, there is no doubt; make all allowances you may for any use He may have made of the prevailing language and conceptions of His time; make all allowances you may for the undoubted fact that what He did say has of necessity been handed down to us by men who could not see so clearly as He did into the things of God; yet it remains that it is quite impossible to doubt that to His eye, who saw such things as none but He could see, the spiritual world teemed with a rich and varied life. Is there joy in heaven over the triumphs of redeeming grace? It is in the presence of the angels of God. Does he look forward to the world's great harvest home? The reapers are the angels. It is the angels who shall surround the Son of Man at His return to judgment. It is the angels of His little ones who in heaven behold the Father's face; it is the angels who convey the soul of Lazarus to Abraham's bosom; they "shall be like the angels," is His promise for the life to come. Nay, in the crowning struggle at Gethsemane it is the Angel of the Agony who strengthens Him

What time He kneels,
Lone in that garden shade bedewed with blood.

Nor may we hide the converse of His testimony; no, the same is true, and let all those remember it who dare to use the name of the Spirit of Evil to round a sentence or to point a jest, the same is true when He is dealing with the powers of wickedness; uncleanness and disease are not to Him misfortunes as we call them, they are the devil's work. It is the power not of sin only, but of Satan which He comes to break. It is not that men forget the word, it is the devil takes away the word out of men's hearts. It is the evil spirits who torment and vex men's souls and bodies. Satan it

is whose kingdom is to be overthrown, Satan whom He beholds as lightning fall from heaven. Nay, even as we pray our daily prayer, "Deliver us from evil," we must remember that it is probable that what Christ said was not "Deliver us from evil," it was "Deliver us from the evil one," that is, the devil.

But we to-day are thinking, not of devils, but of angels, and what we say is this, that their bright ministry is vouched for by the teaching of the Church and by the Bible record, and by the Lord Himself.

And is it a barren truth? No truth is barren, or can be, and least of all truths which affect us in our relationship to God. The mould in which our spiritual life is cast is not a little thing; there is a richness and a fullness, there is a grace and tenderness, in what I have called our Catholic inheritance, when every trial which comes to us is ministered by angel hands, when every joy is shared by angel fellowship; and further is it a little thing if it be but a hope that to the guardianship of one such holy being God has entrusted each of us?

My oldest friend, mine from the hour
When first I drew my breath;
My faithful friend that shall be mine,
Unfailing, till my death.

Does not this little span of human life gain a fresh dignity, nay rather does it not gain a terrible intensity of interest, when we regard it as the battlefield of principalities and powers, who labour for the aiding and the defiling of man's soul? Does not the very thought of God Himself become more worthy and more full of awe as we behold Him seated on the throne, and gaze upon the elders and the living creatures and the golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints, and hear the voice of many angels round about the throne, ten thousand times ten thousand, saying, "Worthy is the Lamb"?

And when we meet together at the table of the Lord, is it not something if we may believe that there the angels join us in our prayers? St. Paul most certainly believed that this was so. And you will not forget that in that same adventurous belief we still are bold to recognise their presence, and to say: "Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious name."

THE East London Church Chronicle states that whilst only a quarter of the present year remains, very little more than half of the £20,000 for which the Bishop of Bedford finds himself forced to appeal this year has as yet been contributed.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

HOW TO OBTAIN PEACE.

BY THE REV. R. R. KANE, LL.D., INCUMBENT
OF CHRIST CHURCH, BELFAST.

SERMON PREACHED AT ULSTER HALL, BELFAST,
ON THE 25TH AUGUST, 1889.

"And when He was come near He beheld the city, and wept over it."—ST. LUKE xix. 41.

THE Lord Jesus Christ, my brethren, was unlike any one else who ever lived upon this earth. It is our privilege and our calling to grow like Him, to be changed into the same image; but between Him and the saint who attains nearest to His holy likeness there will always remain an immeasurable unlikeness. He was man, indeed, very man; but united to the human nature in Him was the Divine nature, and hence His uniqueness. Hence He must ever stand alone *sui generis* in the history of the world. Now, here we have Him making His triumphal entry into Jerusalem; the crowds shouting His praises surround Him. All the circumstances of His progress point to the fulfilment in Him of the prayers and predictions and aspirations of all the ages. In their enthusiasm the multitudes spread their garments in His path, and cut down the branches of palm-trees to symbolise and celebrate His victory. Another who had been the object of such popular welcome and exultation would have been elated and jubilant; there would have been the fire of triumph in his eye and the flash of triumph in his face. But Jesus had a solemn, sad countenance, as if He heard not the shouts of the multitude, and when the city towards which He was journeying lay revealed to Him He wept and sobbed and gave vent to His unutterable grief in broken ejaculations, which the Holy Spirit by the pen of the Evangelist has recorded, and from which we may gather what the cause of His sorrow was. But can you imagine what an interruption that was of the joyous shouts of the multitude; while all around Him were jubilant, and made Him the object of their acclaim, He lifted up His voice and wept and bewailed the approaching fate of the city which He had looked to with special favour, and in the midst of which He had wrought most of His mighty works. Now, brethren, Jesus Christ did not weep for Himself. He might, indeed, have been thinking of what was to happen to Himself. A dreadful ordeal lay before Him. Before the end of the week, of which this was the first day, the cup which His Father had given Him to drink, He was to drink to the very dregs. He was scanning the future, and in the very near future His eye might have caught Gethsemane, with its fathomless depths of woe, and the judgment hall, with its treachery, and its coarse, pitiless jeers; and Calvary, with its cross-crowned summit. These things might well have been in His mind and caused the woe and anguish which

He uttered in these broken sentences of my text ; but neither the triumph of the moment nor the betrayal and Cross of the near future occupied our Lord's thoughts—"When He beheld the city He wept." As soon as its towers and palaces and busy throngs caught His eye, while others looked with admiration and awe upon the splendid spectacle, "He wept." It was the city of David, associated with all the grandest triumphs of the Shepherd King. There were columns on which his many victories were recorded. There was the Hill of Zion, which he apostrophised in many of his beautiful psalms ! It was the city of Solomon. There was the Temple in not only the glory which he had left it in, but even greater glory. It was the city which had been so distinguished by God's providential care, the holy and beautiful city—and well might a train of thought, grateful to the mind of Jesus as a patriot Jew, have been suggested by the vision of Jerusalem as it lay revealed to Him. But His thoughts were altogether connected with His own mission to Jerusalem. He had come to bring peace and salvation. All the peace and salvation which their own prophets had so delighted to anticipate, as when they wrote : "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that bringeth good tidings of good things, that publisheth peace ; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth."

He had come to bring all that peace and salvation, but the city had rejected Him, and was about to perpetrate her final terrible act of rejection, to bring the guilt of His blood upon her head. And the glamour of her present beauty and splendour did not blind Jesus to the desolation and woe which would assuredly follow swiftly upon her sin ; and now, to the amazement and the consternation of the beholders, He wept aloud. He shed the silent tear at the grave of Lazarus, but here He lifts His voice in loud lamentation, and we can imagine what a reverent but amazed hush succeeded to the loud acclaims of the multitude, and then how they held their breath as they discovered that He not only wept, but, as far as His grief would allow Him, spoke. Hushed was every sound that they might catch His broken sentences, as, looking steadfastly through His tears upon Jerusalem, He said : "Oh, that thou hadst known !" Thou Jerusalem, the city which God has chosen to place His Name there. The city built and adorned and dwelt in and defended by men who loved and feared God. The city that such a bright and glorious career lay before ! The city exalted to heaven itself with privilege ! "If thou hadst known." Who can picture the past of privilege and prayer and promise and entreaty and warning which that word "Thou" recalled to the mind of our Saviour ! Had it not been said in the early dawn of their history, "What nation is there so great that hath God so nigh to them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him

for?" And all that spiritual greatness, that greatness of privilege, came up before the mind of Christ as He ejaculated, "If thou hadst known." And then our Saviour's thoughts seem to take a sudden turn, for He says, "Even thou."

A vision of Jerusalem's rebellions occurs to Him—how she killed the prophets, and stoned them that were sent unto her ; how truly she answered to the husbandman in the parable, who, instead of rendering to the lord of the vineyard the fruit in its season, received his messengers with ever-increasing boldness and ingratitude, beating one and stoning another, until their wickedness culminated in the murder of his son, whom he had sent in the expectation that they would at least reverence his son. Such a vision of Jerusalem's rebellions rose up before the mind of our Blessed Saviour. He saw how God's messengers had been despised, and how He, God's Son, was about to suffer mockery and scourging at their hand, and to be put to a shameful death. But all this did not shut out the possibility of salvation and peace, for God is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and of great kindness ; and if the wicked will but forsake their ways and turn to the Lord He will have mercy upon them, and will abundantly pardon them ; and so Christ says : "If thou, even thou, rebellious, ungrateful, bloodstained Jerusalem—if thou hadst known the things which belong to peace, then might the doom have been averted, and peace in deed, and not merely in name, have been thine." But our Blessed Saviour goes further, and the next sentence His grief allows Him to utter is, "At least in this thy day." Many a day the Jews had—many a warning, many a call. I suppose vital religion was at its lowest ebb amongst them about the time of the Incarnation, and yet even then we know there were godly people whose lives must have served as a call and a warning to repentance ; and in other times, when religion was less decayed, there must have been many more like Anna and like Simeon. And then think of the mighty prophets ; now it is an Isaiah, with his burning periods and his evangelical spirit ; now it is an Amos, with his honest bluntness and his direct and pungent exhortations ; now it is Jeremiah, with his plaintive tones and his deep, far-reaching parables ; and now it is Hosea, pleading as for his very life with the people to return to the Lord. Yes, many a day of grace and visitation the Jews had ; but though they had failed to profit by all these, if at least in this day—this day of special grace to the lost sheep of the house of Israel—this day when Jesus performed His mighty miracles amongst them, preached His wonderful discourses in their ears, lived His life of translucent beauty and holiness, going in and out amongst them—this day, which kings and holy men were permitted to see from afar, and seeing rejoiced, as Job when he said : "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth ; and though

after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." If at least in this day in which all human history centres, if in the crowning day of opportunity they had known the things of peace. Of a truth the Jews brought their doom upon their own heads. "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself!" What could have been done to awaken them to repentance, to warn them of danger, to incite them to value spiritual things? What could have been done that God did not in mercy and love do? As God says Himself by the Prophet Jeremiah: "Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day I have ever sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them." And in the wake of the prophets He sent His Son, who was heralded by the last and greatest prophet crying: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." What an example we have here of God's merciful and forbearing dealings, and of our ingratitude and unbelief and rebellion. I hope we are making an application to ourselves of this discourse. Has God sent His messages to us? How have we received them? Have we had our days of grace and visitation? I know I have had a great many; I cannot remember a time when God was not speaking by His Providence and Word and Spirit to my very inmost soul! Has it not been the same with you? And to-day in the Gospel of His love God is speaking to us in warning and invitation and promise, so that we are and shall be without excuse; and, if the doom come, it will be because we have dragged it down on our own heads. If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong to peace. The name of the city suggested this word "peace," and in the case of a city peace means everything. Our Lord could see in the vision of the future on which He looked, Jerusalem, instead of being blessed with peace, surrounded with armies; and what a contrast between peace and the havoc, and woe, and death brought by that encompassing host. Aye, that terrible visitation was present to the mind of our Blessed Saviour, as the 43rd verse tells us: "The days shall come upon thee that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee around, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave on thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." Here is a graphic portrait, and, as a learned writer says: "Sternly, literally, terribly, within fifty years was that prophecy fulfilled. Four years before the war began, while as yet the city was in the greatest prosperity and peace, a melancholy maniac traversed its streets with the repeated cry—'A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and her holy house, a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides, and a voice against this whole

people'; nor could any scourgings or tortures wring from him any other words except—'Woe! woe to Jerusalem! woe to the city! woe to her people! woe to the holy house!' until seven years afterwards, during the siege, he was killed by a catapult." His voice was but the renewed echo of the voice of prophecy. The destruction and downfall which the Jews invited and defied came upon them, and in the prophecy of that destruction we do not see one line or shade darker than the reality. They would not know the things which belonged to their head, their security, their happiness; they would not know Jesus Christ. In knowing Him they would have found peace and every blessing. He tells us Himself He would have gathered them as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings. What a picture of peace, security, and happiness this is, and if they had received Christ instead of rejecting Him, if they had revered Him instead of spurning Him, if they had crowned Him with their love and homage instead of with the jagged thorns, then indeed peace and not a sword would have been their blissful portion. Brethren, to know Christ is to have peace; to know Christ is to have every blessing. To know Him as man full of sympathy, our kinsman, whose Blood was shed to make peace. To know Him as God full of grace, able to save to the uttermost. To know Him as the Saviour from sin, as the counsellor in difficulty, as the guardian in danger. To know Him as the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. All their woe came upon the Jews because they did not know and esteem Christ; all their security and blessing and peace would have come upon them had they known Him. "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent!" Oh, that all here would know Him, His love, His grace, His blood, His power, for these are the things which belong to peace—peace of conscience, peace with God, peace for evermore.

Happy they who trust in Jesus,
Sweet their portion is and sure;
When the foe on others seizes,
He will keep His own secure.
As the bird beneath her feathers
Guards the objects of her care,
So the Lord His children gathers,
Spreads His wings and hides them there.
Thus protected,
All their foes they boldly dare.

And what is the meaning of the solemn words, "Now they are hid from thine eyes?" We cannot help, indeed, believing that the Jews in their subsequent treatment of Jesus were given over to a wild, blind infatuation. They clamoured for His Blood. They preferred a brutal robber and murderer to Him. When they saw Him scourged and mocked they did not pity Him. When they saw His dignified and majestic bearing before Pilate they did not reverence Him. When His captors fell down before Him in unwilling homage they had

no misgivings as to their guilt, and the Divine character of Him whom they were despising and rejecting. If ever a people were delivered over to hardness of heart, to wild, blind infatuation, the people and their leaders who sacrificed Christ were that people. God's Spirit had departed from them, and left them to add guilt to guilt; and so, as St. Peter reminded them, they denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto them—they killed the Prince of Life. As St. Stephen said, "They were the betrayers and the murderers of the Just One." So that it is, indeed, an awful judgment when any one is given over to blindness and hardness of heart, when the Spirit of God leaves the soul in its infatuation and blindness; and in cases when privileges have been multiplied, and when each succeeding period of life has been marked by gracious dealings of God's Providence, and when all this has been met by indifference and unbelief, until a habit of indifference and unbelief has been actually contracted. In such cases what is the spiritual condition of those who have been thus dealt with, and who have made this return? What but that of one from whom the things which belong to peace are hidden, and he is given over to his infatuation, whatever it may have been. He is joined to his idols; let him alone! Well, thank God, now is our opportunity; now is our day of grace. Jesus calls us to Him, and He will give us peace. We have tried the world, and we know it cannot give us peace. Many a man has lost the track of peace altogether by looking for it in this world. True peace, where shall I find it? If I take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost ends of the earth, shall I find it there? If I go down into the deeps, shall I find it there? No; it is to be found in Christ. When I look at the past my sins trouble me. He pardons them, and so I have peace. When I look at the present, my weakness and my temptations trouble me. He is my strength, and so I have peace. When I look into the future, death and judgment and eternity fill me with awe; but, He says, He has gone before to prepare a place for me. Blessed Jesus, may I know Thee as mine, more and more, so shall my peace flow as a river, on, on to the ocean of everlasting peace.

THE anniversary of the Bishop of St. Alban's Fund for London over the Border and Tilbury Dock District, was held at Hatfield on Thursday last, by the invitation of Lord William Cecil, the rector. Canon Furze preached an eloquent sermon in the parish church, powerfully urging the appeal which the Bishop has just made for £9,000 to be received or promised before Christmas. After service a public luncheon was held at the "Salisbury Arms," under the presidency of Viscount Cranborne, M.P. This was followed by a public meeting at the Countess Anne's School, at which Lord Cranborne again presided, and which was largely and influentially attended.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary. **OBEISITY IS CURED**, and will be sent, gratis and post free, on application to the

Medical Battery Company, Limited,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1889.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

IN England, and in America too, the question is coming to the front whether women should preach in public or not. A practical question of this kind is settled in the long run far more by the test of experience than by general arguments, but one or two points deserve a moment's thought. The first question which any woman, or any man, must answer, who feels the power of Christ stirring her or his heart to carry His message to the world is, "Can I do it?" the second, "Ought I to do it?" Without power there can be no duty; but given the power, only the overwhelming voice of duty calling elsewhere can justify inaction. Home, beyond all question, is the first place to be thought of; and the man or woman who builds up a Christian home builds up a Christian Church at the same time. But there are thousands of women who have missed this blessed opportunity of service; and those possessing the power to teach must not be condemned to sit idle because other sisters have a work elsewhere. In many cases, too, as the years pass, the demands of the home grow less, while experience and wisdom increase; and the matured faculties of many a mother may surely be used in this great cause. Mrs. Booth has stated the case very clearly and forcibly in the following lines:—

In view of the wonderful results of woman's public labours one may ask, if "the State commits an injustice in debaring a woman from the rights of a citizen because she chooses to perform the good works of a saint," what sort of an injustice does a Church commit which debars a woman from the right and privilege of preaching a living Saviour of the myriads who are literally rotting and dying in heathen

darkness for lack of those who will stoop low enough to get at them with the bread of life? God and humanity demand an answer.

And how can the Christian Church complain that the supply of teachers is failing, if it will not accept the women who are ready and able to work?

In the poorer parts of East London it is the experience of any one who is really conversant with the true state of affairs, that women's work is often infinitely more valuable than men's work. There must be, and always is, an immense power for good in the tender influence of a gentle woman, and where that influence is made use of to promote the kingdom of Christ, its value cannot be too highly estimated. Among the poor especially there is sufficient of the stern reality of life, and therefore the marked difference of action which kind womanly help affords to the eyes and minds of those whose lives are cast amidst toil and misery, is in itself an inestimable advantage. The more women are pressed into Christian work, the more that work will thrive. We only wish that women's work in the Church were more thoroughly organized.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRISTIAN GRATITUDE.

SIR,—I suppose that there is scarcely a commoner occasion of offence to thoughtful hearers than the misuse in sermons of texts arising from ignorance, carelessness, or a desire to be original, or sensational. Not long ago I listened, with what feelings I will not describe, to a well-known preacher who had undertaken to advocate some scheme for evangelising the masses. Having the whole Bible to range over for an appropriate text, what did he do but pick out poor Jeremiah, let down into the dungeon and sinking in the mire, and make him the elaborate type of the sinner going from bad to worse, sinking deeper and deeper in vileness and misery, hoping thereby to move the compassion of his audience, and get a liberal offertory. Thus the saint's martyrdom was held up as the image of the sinner's ruin.

Perhaps of such an incongruity the chief cause was a deficiency in the sense of humour. In one of the sermons in your current number I notice a different kind of misuse, the precise cause of which I leave to others to conjecture. The preacher wishes to explain the Christian way of showing gratitude to God for mercies received; and not content to take for his guide some plain New Testament statements, such as Rom. xii. 1, he startles his congregation by telling them that the teaching of the Bible everywhere is that the true way of showing gratitude to God is by asking for more blessings. This curious method he extracts from his text.—“What shall I render unto the Lord for all His benefits towards me? I will take the cup of salvation and call upon the name of the Lord.” Now, I think that any critical student of the Bible will see

that the phrase, “to call upon the name of the Lord,” though it may sometimes mean simply to ask the Lord for something, has also the wider meaning of confessing and worshipping the Lord, and that it is this wider meaning which the Psalmist intends as the expressing of his gratitude. As if he said. “I will acknowledge the blessing with which my cup is filled by going before the Lord in His sanctuary with invocation, thanksgiving, and praise.” Surely, such a meaning is far more in accord, both with Scripture and common sense, than that from which the preacher infers, that gratitude for a favour is best shown by begging for another.

That he was aware of the strangeness of his interpretation is shown by his imagining his hearers to remonstrate and say, “Surely there is some mistake here; the interpretation is altogether wrong!” The curious thing is that in trying to justify it, and prove that all Scripture teaches the same, he adduces several texts, everyone of which is absolutely irrelevant. Promises to prayer, encouragements to pray, they certainly are; but there is not a syllable in any one of them to the effect, that to ask for more is the right expression of Christian gratitude for mercies already received.

PRESBYTER.

CHURCHMEN IN COUNCIL.

SIR,—May a reader of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT respectfully ask “Churchmen in Council,” whether the Bishop of Lincoln's *maximum* is their *maximum*? If not, what will they conjointly admit and what reject? The same explanation might be given by them of the *minimum*.

ENQUIRER.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I cannot thoroughly accept “J. B.'s” interpretation of either *αἰώνιος* or *κόλασις*. I do not think Dr. Farrar is a first-rate Grecian. Where does Plato use *αἰώνιος* as in antithesis to *endless*? All this criticism on that word proves too much when it proves anything. If the punishment of Matt. xxv. 46, is not eternal, neither is the life. Respecting the meaning of *κόλασις*, there is this word and there are two others, *παῖδεία* and *τιμωρή*. The first of these I would render by *discipline*, the other by *damages* or *indemnity*; *κόλασις* by *punishment*. There is nothing contrary to a sense of justice, but the contrary, in retributive punishment.

19th October, 1889.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

HOME REUNION.

SIR,—In your article, “The Church Congress on Home Reunion,” you have, I think, misunderstood me. You charge me with flinching from the necessary consequence of my belief, “that Episcopal ordination cannot be insisted upon as a necessary condition of *intercommunion* with other Churches.” And in proof of this you quote me as saying: “But let me repeat, if I urge concession here (*i.e.*, with regard to the re-

ordination of ministers who have received non-Episcopal Orders), I urge it only for the express occasion. I urge it because without this concession *reunion* is impossible." You argue that if Episcopacy is, as I admit, not of the essence of a Church, the concession I advocate ought to be admitted, not as temporary, but as permanent. Perfectly true, if I were speaking of "intercommunion." But I beg you to observe that I am speaking of "reunion," and in that case the concession can only be temporary. Let the distinction between "reunion" and "intercommunion" be kept clearly in mind, and there is no inconsistency in what I have said.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

The Deanery, Peterborough.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words in reply to Mr. E. Lawrence? He argues from St. Paul having used the word "overseers" vaguely, as we do clergy. Granted that the term had no definite meaning, yet the office was fixed. There was one in Ephesus and Crete, who ruled a number of clergy, and was responsible for admission to Orders. Till Presbyterians can show among them such a ruler over many, they cannot pretend to follow Apostolic pattern. If "parity among ministers" is contrary to St. Paul as well as to St. John, the Presbyterians must be held "uncatholic" in adopting it. If it can be proved that certain in Elizabeth's time slipped into parishes without Episcopal Orders, it was an irregularity, but no example to us, no more than the Queen communicating beyond the Tweed with Presbyterians, who call Episcopacy Popish, and with Episcopalians on this side of it. Some say there is only one Order, deacons being only churchwardens, and bishop and priest but one; how such can tell God that "He has appointed divers Orders in His Church" is beyond my comprehension. St. Peter call himself a presbyter (1 Peter v. 1); and St. Paul calls himself a deacon (1 Cor. iii. 5). This shows that these terms were not strictly confined, though the offices were distinct.

H. J. RINGWOOD.

MR. SHERRARD'S SERMON ON JUSTIFICATION.

SIR,—Allow me to make a few remarks.

I perfectly agree with him as to his estimate of Bishop O'Brien's sermons on Justification. A good judge said that "he was wafted to a bishopric on a cloud of metaphysics." The Bishop made two astounding assertions in these sermons:—1st, that on faith alone a man had all the benefits of the Gospel; 2nd, that "only so much repentance is necessary as may make faith real." I quote merely from memory, after many years. But I am sure I am right. As to Baptism, the good Bishop retracted before he died. I have a criticism to make. Justifying faith, as explained in the 3rd Homily, is reliance on Christ's merits, and not on faith, or anything else in us. Many virtues are to be present in the man in order to justification, but they justify not. It is God's act. Faith merely clings to Christ's work and death. This distinguishes it from other virtues. Mr. Sherrard seems to say that such trust or reliance cannot exist without a good life. St. James says the contrary, and I see not why any one should rule that such a reliance

is impossible without our heart being affected thereby. Of such a faith, St. James says that it is dead till works come and make it perfect. I think Mr. Sherrard, in thus ruling, is as metaphysical as Bishop O'Brien.

C. C., V.-G.

THE Bishop of Ely, the Bishop of Bedford, the Archdeacon of Oxford, the Vicar of Brighton, and the Medical Officer of Health for Wakefield, have recently presided at Conferences held under the auspices of the Burial Reform Association at Cambridge, London, Oxford, Brighton, and Wakefield. Among those who took part in the meetings were Canons Bright, Ince, Freeling and Heurtley, the Reverend the Warden of Keble, General Lowry, Sir Spencer Wells, and Professor Hodgetts. Resolutions were passed condemning prevalent modes of burial, and urging the Government to amend the Burial Acts.

PROFESSOR MARGOLIOUTH took as the subject of his lecture, at Oxford, the place of Ecclesiasticus in Semitic literature. The words of the Son of Sirach had, he said, come down to us through three, perhaps through four, different channels. We have three ancient translations, or versions, of his work, one in Greek, one in Syriac, and one in ancient and very peculiar Latin. Of these three the ancient Latin was probably not an original authority. It seemed to be generally a translation from our existing Greek version, though the translator seemed to have availed himself of the services of a friend to tell him in many passages what was the original sense of the Hebrew. The other two, the Greek and the Syriac, were certainly original and independent versions from the Hebrew text. Fortunately for the purpose of reconstructing that text, both translators had done their work exceedingly badly. They had translated very literally, had made many mistakes, so that their version as it stood was sometimes absolute nonsense, and in not a few instances had transliterated the original Hebrew into Greek or into Syriac. Besides the three versions there occurred in some of the treatises of the Talmud quotations from the original Hebrew of Ben Sirach. By putting these four sources of information together, it had seemed possible to him and to the late Dr. Edersheim to reconstruct the original Hebrew text. After they had worked for a time at their task, and after he had published his Kennicott Essay on the subject, it had become obvious to him that the Hebrew original was composed in metre, in a metre closely akin to, yet with some slight variations from, one which was familiar to all students of Arabic literature. Of course this discovery greatly aided him in the subsequent reconstruction of the text, and placed the text so reconstructed on a far firmer basis than it could otherwise have been placed upon. But the text as thus reconstructed seems clearly to have been not in ancient, not in middle, but in modern Hebrew, a Hebrew closely akin to that of the Talmud itself. But if this contention can be made good a very important consequence, as the Professor pointed out, follows from it. The work of Ben Sirach was demonstrably written about 200 B.C. If the modern Hebrew was then already in use, the way must have been preparing for it at least from the time of the Captivity onwards, and a dialect approximating to it must have been in course of gradual formation. But if this is so, it is impossible to place any of the

works written in classical Hebrew during a period when a quite alien dialect was in familiar use. But the great majority of the canonical books of the Bible are in classical Hebrew. It becomes, therefore, on this showing, impossible to assign them a post-Exilic origin. Such is the Professor's contention. How far he has succeeded in making good his position, above all how far we can trust implicitly his restoration of the original text of Ecclesiasticus, it will be for Semitic scholars after a careful review of the facts to decide. Meanwhile Mr. Margoliouth has certainly produced an ingenious, if not absolutely convincing, plea for a suspension of judgment before accepting wholesale some of the latest results of Old Testament criticism.

THE Rev. J. W. Horsley writes:—"The procession before the beginning of the Church Congress was most impressive; it will, I trust, become the rule. But it would have been more striking and educative if the very many clerics whom I saw in the streets or in the churches had taken the trouble to have brought their vestments and to have joined our ranks. A hood takes up no room in a portmanteau, a cassock keeps one warm during the journey to those uttermost parts of the land in which Congresses are usually held, and a surplice would not crowd out the other 'white alb plain' which is assumed at the close of the day. But, with regard to the appearance of the procession, I would note two things—1. That some yet need to learn that to walk in order and orderly is better than to waddle and chatter in a gathered sheet with a crumpled wideawake a-top. 2. That it might have been supposed that when we were asked to appear in cassock, surplice, hood, and college cap, we might have shown courtesy by obedience, and not, some of us, donning black stoles or scarves or wearing birettas. I might also ask why, while some of the Bishops wore their scarlet chimeres, others preferred the black ones, which are practically undress uniforms?"

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

AN anonymous donor has sent to the Bishop of Colchester a gift of £200 for the Trinity College (Oxford) Mission in East London.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Amos, Rev. Andrew, Missioner-in-Charge of the Clare College Mission, Rotherhithe.
Atkinson, Rev. R. C., M.A., Curate of Wath, Rotherham; Vicar of Yedingham, Scarborough.

Barrass, Rev. J. Stephen, Clerical Secretary of the Church of England Young Men's Society; Lecturer at St. Bride's, Fleet Street.
Bliss, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Rector of Yockleton, Shrewsbury.
Burton, Rev. Albert Edward, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Carter, Rev. W. C., Vicar of Little Tew; Rector of Cornwell, Oxon.
Causton, Rev. F. J., M.A., Vicar of Petersfield; Surrogate for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.
Creery, Rev. A. M., Curate-in-Charge of Christ Church, Harwood, Bolton-le-Moors.
Daniel, Rev. Charles A., Vicar of Coatham, Redcar; Vicar of St. Petrox, Dartmouth.
Douglas, Rev. E. K., M.A., East London Missionary-in-Charge of the Eton College Mission, Hackney Wick, N.E.
Evans, Rev. Canon William Howell, M.A., Vicar of Potton, Bedfordshire; Vicar of Rhyl, Flintshire.
Eyre, Rev. Edward John, B.A., Curate of St. John's, Clevedon; Rector of Flax Bourton, Somerset.
Griffiths, Rev. B. P., M.A., Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for the Diocese of St. David's.
Hanbury, Rev. W. F. J., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Chieveley, Berkshire; Vicar of Swanmore, Isle of Wight.
Hogarth, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Barton-upon-Humber; Rector of Harston, Leicestershire.
Lawson, Rev. F. P., M.A., R.D., Diocesan Inspector for Northamptonshire, Vicar of Preston Deanery; Rector of Sudborough.
Leathes, Rev. Stanley, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Cliffe-at-Hoo, Rochester; Rector of Much Hadham, Herts.
Marsh, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Northwich; Chaplain of the Workhouse.
Martin, Rev. Granly Clarke, B.A., Vicar of St. John's, Folkestone; Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Renshaw Street, Liverpool.
Martin, Rev. John, B.A., Vicar of Grendon Bishop, Herefordshire.
Milne, Rev. Percy Henry, M.A., Rector of Evershot-with-Frome, St. Quentin and Melbury Bubb, Dorset.
Rawston, Rev. A. G., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. John's, Oulton, Rothwell.
Ross, Rev. George Gould, M.A., D.C.L., Vicar of Treneglos and Warbston, Launceston.
Russell, Rev. C. D., M.A., Rector of Bleadon; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Bath and Wells.
Smith, Rev. A. H., B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Wolverhampton.
Statham, Rev. Sherard M., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Stow-upland.
Steele, Rev. C., Curate of St. Edward's, Romford; Chaplain of the Workhouse.
Stephenson, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Forton; Surrogate for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.
Stoodley, Rev. T. A., M.A., Head Master of Spalding School; Incumbent of Wykeham Chapel, Spalding.
Utterton, Rev. F. E., M.A., Vicar of Leatherhead, Surrey; Honorary Canon in Winchester Cathedral.
White, Rev. R. A. R., M.A., Vicar of Titchfield; Surrogate for Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.
Wright, Rev. W. B., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Compton, Leek.
Wynne, Rev. Edward, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Forest Gate, Essex.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hamond, Rev. Peter Francis, Vicar of South Mymms, at Newton Abbot, on the 12th inst., aged 44.
Papillon, Rev. John, M.A. Univ. Coll., Oxon, forty-eight years Rector of Lexden, at Lexden Rectory, Colchester, on the 19th inst., aged 82.
Phillimore, Rev. George, M.A., at Elindene, Maidenhead, on the 14th inst., aged 81.
Price, Rev. William Henry, M.A., J.P. for Gloucestershire, at Coln St. Dennis Rectory, Gloucestershire, on the 13th inst., aged 76.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MAGNIFICAT.

BY REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL,
SUNDAY AFTERNOON, AUGUST 4TH.

"And Mary said, My soul hath magnified the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden."—LUKE i. 46-48.

NO fact is more attested by wide experience, and few facts are more pregnant with significance and warning, than the tendency of the human mind to lose its hold of the sense and power of language, especially of religious language, after constantly repeating it. Words, however sacred, and although prescribed for universal use by the highest of all authorities, and however richly endowed with spiritual meaning, do yet become to us, through the process of constant usage, barren and unfruitful, unless an effort is made from time to time to recover, to reassert in the human mind their original sense and power. So it is even with that most sacred prayer which our Lord Himself prescribed for the use of His disciples. Neither the experiences of our own souls, nor the associations of ages which may have gathered round the several petitions of the Lord's Prayer avail to save us from saying it in a thoughtless and formal way, unless we constantly remind ourselves of what it means, what it has meant to millions, what it might mean to ourselves. And as this is true of words which our Lord Himself bids us use, so it is no less true of other inspired words which His Church has selected from the sacred records as being especially suited for constant employment in public worship. It holds good of those Psalms which, like the 95th, or the 100th, or the seven Psalms of Penitence, have been chosen for frequent use on account of their spiritual intensity, and even of those three hymns in which the earliest saints of the New Testament heralded the birth of the Divine Redeemer—the Song of Zacharias, or the *Benedictus*; the Song of Simeon, or the *Nunc Dimittis*; and, not least, the Song of Mary, the *Magnificat*.

And it is in view of this consideration that I propose, God willing, to devote the Sunday afternoons of this present month to such consideration as time will permit of the familiar but always well-understood words of this, the first in order and the greatest of all Christian hymns—the *Magnificat*.

There is no mistaking the prominence assigned
Vol. XXVIII.—No. 723.

in the English Prayer Books of the Church of Christ to the Hymn of Mary. It is the heart, the centre of our Evening Service. All else leads up to it, or expands it, or radiates from it. We mount upwards to it by successive steps, by confession of the sins which disqualify the soul for true communion with God in prayer or praise, by the prayer which makes all other communion with God easy and natural, by psalms which express the longings of the soul for some nearer contact with God, or which sadly deplore obstacles to it, or which joyfully anticipate its realisation by some lesson from the Old Testament, which, whether it be history or prophecy, narrative or moral teaching, poetry or prose, everywhere and always speaks of Jesus Christ, speaks of Him as the contrast to the human failures or as the crown to the human excellences, which it describes as the Heavenly Visitant, who by-and-bye will still man's fears and will warrant his hopes. Now, as of old, unless there be a veil over the heart, in the reading of the Old Testament, the Great Teacher Himself accompanies us through its pages, and, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounds to us in all those ancient Scriptures the things concerning Himself. And thus we approach the hymn which proclaims that all for which psalmists and prophets have yearned has in very truth and deed come to pass. Mary might seem to stand evening by evening in the Church of her Divine Son, and in strains which we shall consider she celebrates an event compared with which all else in human history is insignificant indeed. As from her thankful heart the incense of praise ascends to the eternal throne, first in one and then in another incensed wreath of almost unrivalled beauty of tint and form, we know that the hardest questions of a man's mind have been answered, and that the deepest yearnings of his heart have been satisfied by the coming down from heaven of the Only-Begotten to be born by a human mother, to die at the hands of His creatures, and to rise again. After this all else may well seem pale and poor, but it is this great truth, set forth or latent in every line of the *Magnificat* which carries us on to the end of the Evening Service from the second lesson, in which the Incarnate Son speaks to us Himself or by the lips of His Apostles; to the *Nunc Dimittis*, in which we take leave of His message with a thankful joy; to the Creed, in which we brace ourselves for the toils and pains of life by a new profession of belief in Him; to the concluding prayer, in which His omnipotent intercession is at once the warrant of our praying at all and of the confidence that we shall be heard, not for our merits, but for His.

It may seem strange that from time to time persons who have felt no difficulty about the use of purely Jewish psalms in Christian worship have been disposed to take offence at the public use of the *Magnificat*, or, indeed, of the three Christian

hymns which are preserved for us in St. Luke's Gospel. This feeling found expression a few years after the Book of Common Prayer had come into public use. It was objected that unless we could all be in the exact circumstances of Zacharias at the birth of the Baptist, or of Simeon at seeing our Lord in the Temple, or of Mary at the visitation, we have no adequate reason for singing their hymns. This amounts to saying that no hymn or psalm is to be used by any other person than its composer, unless the circumstances of the composer himself can be exactly reproduced in the case of the man or of the Church that uses his hymn. Not to trace the application of this rule to modern and uninspired compositions which are largely in use among us this day, it is obvious to observe that it would forbid any use whatever of the Psalter in public or in private devotion—a use to which, however, oddly enough, the old objectors do not seem to have objected, for every psalm was composed in a single set of circumstances, some of which can, while some cannot, be ascertained, and yet, so far as I know, it has never been contended that because we cannot make these circumstances our own we are precluded from using the Psalms. We are none of us in the position of David, persecuted by a jealous sovereign, or insulted and rebelled against by a favourite son, or bringing up the ark to the sanctuary of Zion, or ordering a royal household according to the Divine law. The glories of Solomon, the conquest and humiliation of Rehoboam, the repulse of Sennacherib, the ruin and desolation of Jerusalem by the Babylonian conqueror, the sadness of the captives weeping by the waters of Babylon, the laying of the cornerstone of the Temple after the exile—these, and many other like subjects or events, are the occasions of the Psalms, which yet we use at this hour to express the fears, or the hopes, or the resolves, or the aspirations of our own souls. Clearly, if such a difference of circumstances is not fatal to our singing Hebrew Psalms, it cannot preclude us from using New Testament hymns, which, as Hooker has said, concern us so much more than the songs of David, as the Gospel touches us more than the Law. But, in truth, whether it be Jewish psalm or Christian hymn, we Christians use them because their inspiration lifts them above the limits of the time, the place, the events which witnessed their composition. As a work of real natural genius, whether it be poem, or painting, or speech, or statue, has that in it which detaches itself from the study or the studio of the poet or the artist, and makes it belong to all times and countries, so much more does a work of Divine inspiration bear in it this note of universal applicability. It is independent of places, and events, and epochs, and authorships, and, indeed, of everything save His mind, from whom it proceeds, and that heart and understanding of His creatures who need it and who welcome it.

The *Magnificat*, then, is the hymn of the Incarnation. It was uttered in circumstances the like of which had never before, and have never since, surrounded any human being. Mary had been told at Nazareth by a heavenly messenger that she was to be the mother of Him in whom all God's best promises to Israel and to the human race were to be fulfilled, and she was to be His mother, not in the ordinary way of nature, but as became His pre-existing glory, and as was needed to cut off the entail of evil which came down from the first father of our race. In a new and supernatural way "The Holy Ghost"—so ran the prediction—"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore, also, that Holy Thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Mary knew that she was to be the mother of the Divine Messiah when she traversed the land from Nazareth to a country house some few miles from Jerusalem on a visit to her cousin Elisabeth, the future mother of the Baptist. It was their meeting which was the immediate occasion of the *Magnificat*. Elisabeth had no sooner heard from the lips of Mary the wonted salutation, "Peace be to thee," with which religious Jews greeted each other after a long absence, than under the influence of the Holy Spirit which filled her soul, she broke out into words which mark the high significance of Mary's destiny scarcely less clearly than does her own *Magnificat*. She spake with a loud voice: "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb; and whence is this to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" Elisabeth was the elder woman, and, as the wife of Zacharias, she was in a higher social position than Mary; but few things in her religious history are more beautiful than her ready and unstinted recognition of the higher vocation of her younger relative. "Whence is this to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" The closing words of Elisabeth were at once a blessing and a prophecy, but they touched a spring in the illuminated soul of Mary, and she forthwith uttered her *Magnificat*. She uttered it, as it would seem, at a single jet, but as it passed from her lips it fell, as is usual with Eastern poetry, not of set design, but by an instinct of intrinsic fitness, into divisions of unequal length which we moderns should call "strophes."

Mary begins by offering up to God, with the whole strength and resources of her spiritual being, that praise which she knows to be His due always, and especially in view of the signal privilege that has been vouchsafed to her: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour, for He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden." And then, in a second strophe, she dwells for a moment on the singular and gracious distinction whereby she has been chosen to be the mother of the Incarnate Son.

"For behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath done to me great things, and holy is His Name. And His mercy is on them that fear Him throughout all generations." But during these moments of thankful exultation her vision has widened to embrace new and larger horizons, and so, in a third strophe, she traces some of the relations of the Incarnation of her Son to the action of God's providence in the history of human nations and human lives: "He hath showed strength with His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down princes from their thrones, He hath exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, but the rich He hath sent empty away."

And then, in a concluding strophe, she traces the great gift which, through her, has been bestowed upon the human race, up to its sources in the compassion and in the faithfulness of God: "He, remembering His mercy, hath holpen His servant Israel, as He promised to our forefathers, Abraham, and his seed for ever."

It has more than once been suggested that such a hymn as this is not the sort of response which it would be natural for us to make in reply to such a congratulation as Elisabeth's, and it is hinted that the composition may be really due to some later writer, whether evangelist or another. Now, upon this it may be observed that "natural" is a term of very varying import, and that what is natural to one person, or people, or age, is far from being natural to another. We have only to look around us to know that persons of different temperaments meet exactly similar circumstances very differently. One man is reserved and sparing of his words, another is effusive; this man checks his feelings, that man indulges them; one is as literal and prosaic as may be, another almost inevitably expresses himself in the language of poetry. And then the Eastern and the Western nations differ now as they always have differed in these matters. To many an Arab, at this hour, it is perfectly natural to discuss an every-day occurrence in words with the style, and the form, and the rhythm of a poetical composition. That which an European would put into a few words, an Arab would expand into what is virtually a poem, with a rhythmic rise and fall, and with refrains and repetitions and appeals to all kinds of higher considerations, not foreign to the subject, but not necessary to its discussion. No Englishman who had just lost his king and his friend would immediately burst out into an effusion such as that in which David laments the death of Saul and Jonathan at Mount Gilboa; but in David's case, as in that of many another Eastern, ancient or modern—the fact of inspiration quite apart—it was perfectly natural to do so. And Mary, instinct with the spirit of prophecy, answers Elisabeth's congratulations in a burst of inspired poetry, based on older words

which she had known from infancy, and which she transfigures so as to make them express the fact which fills her grateful soul with wonder and with joy. To measure her utterance by the prosaic rules of our Western temperament is to forget the most obvious laws of equitable criticism. Nor, we may venture confidently to say, is there any real ground for the surmise that Mary's *Magnificat* was the work of any other than Mary. Like the songs of Zacharias and Simeon, it is something more than a psalm and something less than a complete Christian hymn. A Christian poet living after the death and the resurrection of Christ would surely have said more; a Hebrew psalmist would have said less than Mary says. In this hymn of hers we observe the consciousness of nearness to the fulfilment of the great promises, to which there is no parallel even in the latest of the Psalms; and yet even Mary does not speak of the Promised One as an Evangelist or an Apostle would have spoken of Him, by His human name, and with distinctive references to the mysteries of His life and death and resurrection. Her hymn was a true native product of the particular moment of transition in sacred religious history, and of no other, when the twilight of the ancient dispensation was melting, but had not yet melted, into the full daylight of the new. Certainly the *Magnificat* is an inspired song. It belongs to the highest degree of inspiration, and yet it does not claim what we should nowadays think an absolute originality. It is, in truth, modelled very largely, although not altogether, on an olden psalm—that which Hannah had sung many a century before at the door of the Tabernacle at Shiloh, when she brought her infant son Samuel, as she said, "to lend him to the Lord as long as he liveth." Hannah's history had an especial place in the heart and thought of every Jewish woman, not only because she was the mother of the great and austere prophet who may claim, in some respects, an unrivalled importance in the history of the people of revelation, but also because her deferred hopes, her bitter disappointment, the rough handling to which she was exposed, even at the hands of the gentle and weak old man who then held the office of high priest in Israel, had a human pathos that is all their own. At last her hopes were fulfilled, and when, in accordance with the terms of her vow, she consecrated her son, as a Nazarite, to the life-long service of God, her thankful heart found vent in a hymn of praise, in repeating which every Jewish mother and maiden, from that time forth, associated herself with the sorrows and the joys of Hannah. Listen to Hannah first, and then to Mary, and you will perceive how closely their hymns are related to each other. Each of these inspired women finds her joy in God, each praises God in the exaltation of the humble, in the humiliation of the proud; each closes her song by dwelling on God's fulfilment of His promises. Mary, we see plainly, has

reproduced the very ideas, the order of ideas—nay, sometimes the very phrases—of the older hymn, but she has made them subservient to a truth which was seen, if it was seen at all, very dimly across the ages by the older songstress, and which was clear to her herself.

When Strauss characteristically observed that if the Virgin's Hymn had been inspired from on high we might expect more in it of originality, it is not out of place to reflect that the Holy Ghost is not bound to adopt the exact standard of originality which may approve itself to a modern literary man of a sceptical turn of mind. Originality does not always consist and only in the production of new material, new thoughts, new phrases. Originality may discover itself in a high degree of excellence when old ideas and old phrases are enlisted in the service of some newly-proclaimed truth. When in her inspired *Magnificat* Mary draws so largely upon the ancient hymn of Hannah, she is only doing what inspired men again and again had done before her. We cannot read the Bible carefully without noting how psalmist borrows from psalmist, prophet from prophet, and, it might even seem, one evangelist from another—the first object of all the sacred writers being, not the creation or the vindication of a poor reputation for originality, but the clear exhibition of truth through the employment of those precise words and thoughts which are best able to do it justice. The first strophe of Mary's hymn is a burst of praise, and in this praise we may note one or two matters for more especial consideration.

There is, first of all, the fact that in the order of Mary's thoughts the praise of God comes first. To give God His due is not with Mary an afterthought, a decoration, an accompaniment of something else, of something relating to her friends or to herself. In Mary's soul God takes precedence of all else, and therefore in Mary's Hymn the praise of God takes the lead of all other topics. And this, be it observed, is the case, although her hymn is also an answer to the congratulations of a near relative. She is replying to Elisabeth, but she instinctively, inevitably turns the eye of her soul upward, and addresses her first words to God.

Now, let us consider what would, at least in some cases, have been our own course of procedure. You have achieved, let me suppose, some considerable success, or some position of distinction has been conferred upon you; friends surround you with congratulations, some of them conventional, many of them, let us be sure, sincere. Your friends, after an earthly fashion, paraphrase the words of Elisabeth to Mary. They tell you that your success, your distinction, is a gain, is a joy to them. They associate themselves, by the expression of a warm and intimate sympathy, with your satisfaction and delight; they are honoured, they are decorated, they have succeeded, and been distinguished because you, their friend, have won

distinction and success. Now, how do you reply? You begin by thanking them for their kindness. To succeed in a world where no friends are left to express their joy would no doubt be success robbed of two-thirds of its value, and so we sometimes hear the saying pathetically that success and honours have come too late. And so you tell your friends, with perfect sincerity, that their congratulations are as precious, or more precious, to you than anything that has been done by or done to yourself, and that your first thought on this auspicious occasion is the satisfaction which you have thus occasioned them. The first verse of your real *Magnificat*, if it were written out, might perhaps run thus: "My soul doth magnify the kindness and sympathy of my friends, and my spirit hath rejoiced in the pleasure which I have occasioned them!" Or it may be, frankly, that you give your first thought to yourself. You do not wish to say too much about yourself, but at the same time you will not affect a false modesty. You cannot deny that is the form which a sense of personal merit is apt to take when tempered with some misgivings as to the wisdom of expressing it; you cannot deny that it is a great satisfaction to you that efforts long persevered in without success have at last succeeded, that merits which it might have seemed were entirely overlooked have at last been recognised. You do not wish to dwell too much on the subject, but, on the other hand, your conviction of what you think is the fact, and what you call "a proper pride," compel you to say thus much. With this view you would make the first verse of your *Magnificat* something of this kind: "My soul doth magnify myself, and my spirit hath rejoiced in the efforts or merits which at length have been rewarded as they deserved." But then you are a Christian, or, at least, a Theist. You remember that after all there is such a being as God. If the truth is to be said, you do not perhaps feel Him to be very near to you, but you do not wish to forget Him altogether. If He exists, and you believe that He does exist, He must have something at least to do with everything that goes on, and it is but right that you should recognise this. You recognise it somewhat tardily, and as a thing to be touched on lightly, because, in fact, He is less real to you than you are to yourself—less real to you than your friends are. You would not ignore God, you would not deny His existence, but in many of your moods of mind you think of Him as an idea or a conception, or an atmosphere, rather than as a Living Being. You think of Him as a conception from which man's mind can really subtract something, to which it can really add something as the ages pass. You do not think of Him as a Living Being utterly independent of you, but who is at least as near to you as are the forces which you can measure or touch, about which you can talk to other men, about which you read in the newspapers. Yes;

He is there, but, as you think of Him, on a distant and dim horizon of your thought, and something must be said about Him, but that something must befit, it seems, your very thin and precarious idea of what He is, and so at last, but with reservations, you say your *Magnificat* after a third fashion: "A certain sense of intellectual fitness leads me to magnify the Lord on this occasion, and I experience a certain satisfaction in admitting that now, as at other times, something may be done for me by a Higher Power than myself."

How pathetically is all this in contrast with the generous devotion of Mary! No doubt to Mary the joy of Elisabeth was a real joy, and she cannot but have known that by lineage and training she had been prepared for her own high destiny; but her first thought was of Him from whom all else proceeds, both the warm hearts and the kindness of her friends and the gifts, whether of nature or of grace, which she had herself received. God must claim her first acknowledgment before whom she is as nothing, and yet He, in His condescending mercy, had deigned to visit her as none of his creatures had been visited before. She would only think of the contrast between her nothingness and His magnificence. If she glances at herself for a moment, it is to wonder that she should have been noticed at all by Him, her great Creator. "He hath regarded," not the humility, not the lowly temper; these graces were undoubtedly hers in a very eminent degree, but she is not thinking of them. The original word will not lend itself to such a sense. "He hath regarded the low condition of His handmaiden." Because the contrast between herself and Him is thus present to her, because she is convinced that she has no claim on Him — absolutely none, that whatever she has received has come from His free grace and gift, she must perforce begin with Him. "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in Him my Saviour."

And then she addresses Him with all the faculties and resources of her spiritual being. "My soul doth magnify the Lord, my spirit hath rejoiced." "Soul" and "spirit" are not here different names for the same thing. When St. Paul prays that the whole spirit and soul and body of the Thessalonians may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, He does not use two words where one would have sufficed. No doubt both in Biblical and popular language "soul" and "spirit" are sometimes used alone for the whole immaterial part of man, as when our Lord asked, "What shall it profit a man that he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" or when the Preacher says that, "The spirit shall return to God who gave it." But when, as here, the words occur together in more or less obvious contrast to one another, they stand for the higher and lower parts of the one invisible part of man which accompanies his body and yet is distinct

from it. The soul is nearer to the nature of the body, the spirit nearer to the nature of God: soul is analogous to the higher life of the animals, the animals have nothing at all that corresponds with spirit. Soul is the seat of passion and emotion, of imagination and impulse; spirit—though, as we see in this hymn, it is, like pure reason, capable of sublime joys that are all its own—is the seat of self-measuring and reflective reason the seat of memory, the seat of deliberate and imperative will. Soul, it is plain, lives not far from the frontier of the things of time and sense; spirit belongs to a sphere above, on which the things of time and sense need never intrude; but between them they include the whole of incorporeal nature of man, with all its powers. And Mary summons them all, the highest and lowest, the faculties which traverse the world of sense and the faculties which live among the highest and most abstract truths, to the solemn work of praise: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour."

Are there none of us to whom she might teach a lesson? Some among us might seem to think that a single power of the soul might be told off like a soldier when sent on a particular errand—to discharge the duty of praise. One man bids his fancy engage in the work, and another his affections, and another his reason and sense of the fitness of things, and with another his instinct of beauty turns towards the higher horizon—nay, sometimes it may seem as though no mental or spiritual faculty is bidden to engage in praise at all, and Christians who make a serious effort to pray, and who would be shocked to neglect to do so, leave the duty of praising their Creator to their neighbours or to the choir, or it might almost seem to the organ; and yet what a demand on all the faculties of our being does one such simple and oft-repeated act of praise as, for instance, the *Gloria Patri* make. We say it before we begin the Psalms, we repeat it at the end of each Psalm and each Canticle, except the *Te Deum*. It consists of only two verses; and yet what infinite spheres of thought does it bid us to arouse! Our souls rise first to the three almighty incomprehensible subsistences within the being of the God-head: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost"; and then, remembering that the eternal three have ever been and ever will be what they are, our thought reaches backward into an unbroken and forwards into an unending eternity, while grasping for a second at the present, which, as we touch it, has already mingled with the past: "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end." If any of us should have cause to think that we have paid but scant attention and embarked little or no spiritual effort in this oft-repeated act of praise, let us bethink ourselves of the import of Mary's *Magnificat*.

And, once more, observe the title under which

Mary praises God, "My Saviour." This designation, as you know, although associated by Christian faith in an especial manner with our Lord Jesus Christ, is much older than the New Testament. It grew naturally out of Israel's faith in God's especial and protecting providence. "It is Thou that savest us from our enemies" was the voice of the chosen people from age to age, and the enemies were generally political foes, and the salvation was victory in the field or deliverance from bondage. This outward and temporal salvation was no doubt a religious salvation also, because Israel was the people of God. The defeat of Israel was the defeat of the cause of God, and the victory of Israel was the victory of that cause. But probably a new impulse was given to the more spiritual meaning of the word by what would have seemed to pious Jews a profane assumption of the title of Saviour by the Pagan kings who, after the death of Alexander the Great, founded monarchies in Syria and Egypt. If henceforth "Saviour" was to be applied to the God of Israel, it could only be in an elevated spiritual sense, and it is in this sense that Mary praises God, not so much as her country's Saviour as her own. Nor can the expression be explained by the clause: "He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden," which assigns, indeed, the motive of Mary's praise, but not the explanation of the title which she gives to God. The honour put on her in the Incarnation might be described by many another name, but it was not her salvation, and if she calls upon God as her Saviour, it is for independent reasons. Unique as was her office, magnificent as were the endowments bestowed on her, singular as were her humility, her purity, her likeness to the Most Heavenly, she had, she needed a Saviour. She does not stand outside the universal law, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Hers is not a soul which finds its way to the courts of heaven without recourse to that "one Name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." There is no intermediate position in the kingdom of grace between the Saviour and the saved; there is one Saviour, and all others—be their rank in the spheres of glory what it may, whatever be the graces bestowed on them—all others are the same. Mary owed, and owes, what she was on earth, what she is in heaven, not less entirely to the merits and the precious blood of her Divine Son than does the humblest Christian among us at this hour; and she offers the best praises that her soul can offer to God, not first or only as manifested in the awful attributes of knowledge or of power, but as her Saviour.

And in this, most assuredly, she is a model for us. It is well, indeed, that we should speak of other aspects of the Divine Nature, each one of which is a fitting object of adoring praise; well that we should give thanks to God for the great glory of His power, His intelligence, His love; but

the sense of natural gratitude itself which he has put in our hearts would bid us remember that He has "commended His love to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." There is much else for which we may bless Him—"for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life," but if we know what, indeed, we are, what has been done, or what yet may be done for us, we shall not only thank Him for those earlier proofs of His bounty, we shall bless Him, "above all, for his inestimable love in the redemption of the world," of our single selves, "by our Lord Jesus Christ, for the means of grace, for the hope of glory."

THE *Durham County Advertiser* says that a villa at Bournemouth has been engaged for the Bishop of Durham, who will arrive there shortly from Auckland Castle for a stay of several months.

THE Rev. R. J. Hayne, M.A., vicar of Buckland Monachorum, and one of the Bishop of Exeter's chaplains, was instituted on Wednesday to a Prebend in Exeter Cathedral, by the Bishop, and afterwards installed by the Dean and Chapter at the afternoon service.

ON Sunday night, at Cambridge, Canon Luckcock gave the first of the three lectures on the Intermediate State. Great St. Mary's was well filled, and the large congregation were evidently interested in following his argument on the state of those who have died in the faith.

THE trustees of the Leeds Parish Church have among themselves subscribed a sufficient sum of money to purchase a residence which they intend presenting to Dr. Talbot as the future vicarage of Leeds. There are five-and-twenty trustees, and many of them have subscribed £200 each.

THE *Western Morning News* says that the Rev. J. H. Jones, of St. John's College, Cambridge, who is awaiting ordination, after being educated at the Baptist College, Bristol, accepted the pastorate of the Baptist Chapel, Appledore, in 1887, but resigned within twelve months in order to enter the Established Church. His father was at his decease last year the president-elect of the Welsh Baptist Union, editor of the *Seren Cymru*, the denominational weekly organ, and the South Wales agent of the Liberation Society.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA.
COUGHS, COLDS.
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly **CURED** by simply using the **AMMONIAPHONE**.

FOR THE **Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.**

21s. post free. WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.** **52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.**

Corner of Rabbittone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1889.

LABOUR AND EXERCISE.—No. I.

THAT man gets, by well-directed and useful work, those things needed for his sustenance and for the education and discipline of his mind, does not admit of question. To preserve his health and strength, and to have those enjoyments and comforts which he alone of the inhabitants of the globe can obtain and enjoy, man must work bodily or mentally. Thank Heaven! although the judgment of the world is often harsh and unfair, tinctured with prejudice and distorted by conventionality, in honest toil there is no degradation. Idleness alone is disgraceful. To live on what a man's own labour has acquired is noble and honourable. To fatten on the ill-paid toil of others is degrading and dishonourable.

The laws of health may be remembered and practised, but if one of them is neglected, and that one systematic labour, there cannot be, in the highest sense, peace of mind and vigour of body. These, above all else, make life happy and conduce to its preservation in perfect health. No one would suggest that the writer and the thinker should give themselves up entirely to manual labour, or that the statesman should relieve his overtaxed powers by following the plough one or two days a week — although Lord Sherbrooke's liking for athletic exercise, and Mr. Gladstone's skill as an axeman, are instances of intellectual toil accompanying severe manual labour. What is meant is that every man born into this beautiful world can find work to do, and, whatever it is, is bound to do it conscientiously and energetically. In honest and useful work alone is contentment possible. As the evening of life approaches, and

the toiler looks back and sees how much he has done, there must be a feeling of unalloyed satisfaction to which many a millionaire, who has passed his days in idleness and luxury, is a stranger; but yet how many men can feel satisfied with what they have done? How many, rather, even among the best, have to mourn over opportunities wasted, and inferior work done. The humble mechanic, working at the bench, may, in this sense, be a nobler specimen of manhood than the lord of a large factory.

Some of the rules applying to the regulation of labour are most important, and on their observance depends much of the success rewarding effort. The powers of the mind and the body require, for full perfection, to be developed and exercised. Although it does not follow that a man who only cultivates half his powers is not leading a useful life, yet, unless mind and body are in vigorous working order, pleasure of the highest kind cannot be the result. The barrister or the physician may, each in his way, increase the happiness and prosperity of his clients; but his own health suffers and his bodily vigour is impaired if, content with training and using his brain, his muscular powers are neglected and allowed to waste. The labourer, again, whose work is manual, needs intellectual relaxation in his leisure hours to develop his higher nature, and invest his life with dignity.

There is common sense in the suggestion that every man should learn a trade, at which, in his spare hours, he might amuse himself. Unfortunately trade customs, and the exigencies of a professional career, make such a thing impracticable. The clergyman and the author need not, however, know how to shoe horses or make nails; it is most important, however, that no one whose mind is severely strained should fail to spend some leisure moments in bodily work. Marked improvement in the health of many clergymen, for example, and a decided and welcome change in the tone of many sermons would be apparent, were the preacher oftener to come out of his study and read that great book of Nature everywhere unfolded before human eyes. Work, manual and intellectual, was meant to be a pleasure, a privilege; and when not so viewed, something is wrong.

Most men are destined to pass their lives at mechanical labour. What of that? Apart from other considerations, the mental discipline which every labourer can get from doing his work as well as he possibly can is invaluable. The carpenter at the bench, and the smith at the forge, may have their intellectual powers developed and strengthened, and may be happy and contented, throwing their full energies into their task, and finding in it a labour of love, a boundless field for ingenuity. But although they might make a profession of their occupation; they would also need that mental training only to be got from books, and from pondering over the best thoughts of the best minds.

Labour ought not to begin very early in life. Setting aside the importance of calling forth the powers of the intellect by a few years of school, it is most cruel to consign a child of eight to a factory. His body needs time and fresh air to grow in stature and strength, and the development of the muscles, and the consolidation of the frame, tax the youthful system sufficiently. Hard work and rapid growth cannot go together. The whole future may be blasted by the selfishness and folly of parents in compelling a child to work while still very young. The *physique* and health of town labourers had begun to deteriorate in consequence of the neglect of this important matter, when, fortunately for the happiness of the poor, and the prosperity of the nation, the law interfered, and up to a certain degree, took the young under its protection. Something has been done, but not enough. There is room for further reform in the same direction.

One of the greatest advantages the wealthy possess is that their young people are not sent out early into the world, and when they pass into active life, are not compelled to attempt work beyond their strength. Lads often learn little at school, and leave too early as far as book-learning goes; still, time is given them to grow, and gain strength, and so they enter offices and shops better able to work and advance themselves. Partly in consequence of not being forced to work so early, less sickness and greater longevity are more often the rule among the well-to-do than among the poor.

THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH ON SOCIALISM, GAMBLING, AND BETTING.

SUMMING up a discussion on Socialism, the Bishop said they must be careful, while knowing that many of the advocates of Socialism held doctrines which were very dangerous, that they gave full credit to the nobility of motive and tenderness of sympathy with suffering and wrong which had stirred many of those persons. Christianity, however, made no claim to rearrange the economic relations of men in the State and in society, and he hoped he would be understood when he said plainly that it was his firm belief that any Christian State carrying out in all its relations the Sermon on the Mount could not exist for a week. The two leading principles taught were non-resistance and forgiveness of injuries. It would not be possible for a State to forgive all injuries, or to forgive all criminals. Neither could the English Government, in the event of a French army landing on our shores, afford to give that army a safe escort to London. It was perfectly clear that a State could not continue to exist upon what were commonly called Christian principles, and it was a mistake to attempt to turn Christ's kingdom into one of this world. To introduce the principles of Christianity into the laws of the State would lead to absolute intolerance. The law of Christianity was self-sacrifice, impelled by love; the principle of the State was justice, impelled by force. The State had to do justice between man and man, and to restrain violence; the duty of the Church was clear—namely, not to force Christian principles on the

Statute-book, but to inculcate in the minds of men, both capitalists and labourers alike, to do unto others as they would others should do unto them; to infuse into the minds of men the great principles of justice, to try to make labour just towards capital, and capital just and fair towards labour.

The Bishop said he was anxious that the evils attending the great evil of gambling should be checked. But he did not arrive at that conclusion for precisely the same reasons urged by many of the speakers. There was another question which had to be considered, and that was, What were the means to be resorted to for checking this gambling? They must be always careful to distinguish between two questions—whether a thing was wrong *per se*, and whether it was or was not desirable to invoke the force of the State for checking the wrong. A thing might be very wrong in itself and yet the State might have no business or right to interfere with it; and the State might interfere with things that were not wrong in themselves, but which might be injurious to the welfare of the community. He thought they must first settle the question whether it was wrong, but not with the view of settling whether the State was to suppress it. A thing might be no sin and yet it might be injurious to the State, and, if so, the State would have a perfect right to suppress it. The State had a right to protect its own existence, and if any practice was found injurious to the State it had the right to suppress it in the interests of its own life. The question was not whether it was a sin or not; the State had no business to punish sin, but to punish crime. Every crime was not a sin, and every sin was not a crime. If the State were to forbid their worshipping in their parish churches it would not be a sin for them to do so, but it would be a crime. If they said to him that the State ought not to interfere with gambling because it was not wrong, they were illogical and irrelevant, and they were equally so when they said that gambling was wrong, and that therefore the State ought to put it down. It did not follow that because a thing was wrong the State should step in; but whatever view he might hold as to the sinfulness of betting and gambling, he could cordially agree with the resolution that means should be taken for checking betting and gambling. Whatever might be their views of betting and gambling, in certain circumstances and conditions it was the right and the duty of the State to interfere with what was injurious. Now, whether betting and gambling in clubs, in gambling-houses, was injurious to the State was a matter of separate experience. Gambling-houses had been put down in many foreign countries, not because they were immoral, but because they had proved so frightfully injurious to the best interests of the State, because gambling begot habits of recklessness, dishonesty, and a waste of resources, and was so destructive to the interests of the State that, in the interests of self-defence, the State repressed certain forms of gambling. As to the actual sin of betting, it was a very difficult thing to define wherein exactly consisted the sin in betting. Betting could only be defined as "the purchase of a chance." A betting man put down a certain sum of money on the chance of a certain thing happening. Betting was, however, to be distinguished from gambling. Betting was not always used in a bad sense, and if a man were to say that he would bet 5s. that it did not rain to-morrow, they would not say that that man was a gambler. What they understood by gambling was excessive

betting, and there was a similar distinction to that between drinking and drunkenness. Drinking was not a sin, although drunkenness was. He could not take it upon himself to say that all betting was sin, but he could say that gambling and excessive betting were sin, because they stimulated the passions of avarice and covetousness. But he could not say that the simple fact of buying a chance was a sin. Canon Hull said betting was a waste of money, and it certainly was to the loser, but it was not a waste to the winner. For they could not say that a man wasted money who won it. Betting, however, brought men so very near what was wrong, that he thought it wiser and safer not to bet. Those who were so thoroughly opposed to gambling and betting made a great mistake in trying to prove that it was a sin. He remembered being asked, once, whether doing a certain thing was declared to be wrong. He replied by asking if his questioner knew of anything in the Bible against eating bread and butter. There might be a great deal of sinful eating of bread and butter, for if they ate another man's bread and butter they were guilty of theft. He said at once that all gambling on a large scale was decidedly injurious, not only to the man himself, but to his spiritual life. He was in favour of what the State had done in the way of suppressing gambling, and he wished very much that it would go further. At the same time he very much disliked partial and hypocritical legislation, and laws that, while they put down gambling clubs in Leicester, allowed men to assemble in vast numbers and bet freely at Epsom or Newmarket. He could not see why the Legislature should allow the one and interfere with the other. Legislation, to be respected, should be honest and thorough. The same hybrid and hypocritical legislation had been enacted in this matter as in the case of the drink traffic. The House of Commons provided itself with liquor, and then went and passed resolutions in favour of doing away with it; whereas the House of Commons ought first of all to have made its own reformation appear. Instead of that, however, they found members of Parliament wiping their mouths after drinking brandy and soda at the bar, and then voting to make their neighbours drink cold water. He heartily wished that a law might be passed to prevent all gambling and betting, just as the Legislature had put down gambling with cards and dice. It was said that betting, if stopped, would involve the abolition of horse-racing, and that might injure the breed of horses; but he might say that the abolition of betting would have an improving effect upon the breed of men. He urged them in particular to have their own hands clean, and to do their utmost to encourage their hearers to resist the temptations of betting and reckless attempts to get money quickly.

ON Sunday evening there was a meeting in the Guildhall, Cambridge, where Mr. G. W. E. Russell spoke to some three hundred undergraduates on "Purity of Life." His stirring address was most interesting in many ways, but chiefly from the thoroughly Christian tone which pervaded it, and the unflinching advocacy of confession in the case of those who had fallen before temptation.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE CREDENTIALS OF THE GOSPEL. A STATEMENT OF THE REASON OF THE CHRISTIAN HOPE."
By the Rev. Agar Joseph Beet. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book Room.

WE have read this book with very great pleasure. It is well written, the argument is well sustained, and the best line is taken throughout to meet the scepticism of the age. The author begins with what is often, though wrongly, called Natural Religion, with the internal evidence, that is, of conscience to a holy and just God, and to a Moral Law as shown in the writings of all antiquity, whether within or outside Revelation; and then shows how moral excellence was realised only in Jesus Christ, who yet, unlike all others, made no confession of sin or imperfection Himself. From this he passes to the evidence in the material world, pressing home the arguments for an intelligent Creator borne, however reluctantly, even by Agnostic scientists, who are compelled to admit that no instance of spontaneous generation has ever been proved to occur, from which it necessarily follows that the Creator must in some past period have acted directly on this our world. In a subsequent chapter, this argument is used with great skill in favour of Christ's resurrection; those who say that, because the event is unprecedented—outside the course of those invariable sequences which we call the Laws of Nature—it is therefore incredible, are well asked why should an admittedly unique and exceptional case of renewal of life be more incredible than an equally admitted case of origination of life?

In the next chapter, comparing Christianity with other religions, the writer argues that even in matters which it is not directly concerned with—art, science, literature, and the like, nations which have adopted Christianity have invariably far outstripped all others, thus showing that Christianity has really been the means of saving the world politically and socially. This argument also is in a subsequent chapter very well used against those who say the Apostles were pious, but deluded fanatics; for how can art, literature, and science, which have the search after truth as their very end and aim, possibly be permanently advanced by anything untrue?

In the chapter entitled "Christ and the Christian Documents," the writer is not quite so strong. His summary of St. Paul's doctrine, that "justifying faith is a personal assurance resting upon the promise of God that God will give eternal life to each one who accepts that promise, and therefore to the assured one himself," will not commend itself to all. After all, this is a side issue in a book of Christian evidences; and as soon as the chapter passes on to compare Christ's personal claims with those made by Mohammed or Buddha, the argument again becomes very strong and weighty.

In the next chapter, on the Evidence of the Resurrection, the author shows most ably the difficulties those are in who deny the Resurrection; we do not say the arguments are very novel, but they are so concisely and forcibly put that any decently intelligent reader ought to be able to reproduce the substance of them.

Lastly there is an appendix, wherein certain particular arguments are noticed—not always very happily. We cannot exactly subscribe to the opinion

that "sun, moon, and stars were . . . made for our delight and instruction, and in order to shed light on our paths and guide our steps, and the sun was made to ripen our harvests and give us food;" we should rather prefer to believe that the man who could so write was somewhat lacking in the sense of humour. But this and other small criticisms we could make are very trifling blots on a very good book which we can heartily recommend to our readers.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—Aristotle in his "*De Calo*" says that the proper meaning of the word αἰών is eternal, and derives it from αἰεί ὤν, endless being; and no words can more forcibly point out eternity than these. I suppose it will be admitted that he is a better authority on the meaning of a Greek word than either Archdeacon Farrar or that lay friend of whom "J. B." speaks in his letter to the PULPIT of the 19th inst.

It will, I suppose, also be admitted that the Septuagint translators of the Old Testament knew the meaning of the Greek words they employed in their translation, and that they also knew the meaning of the words in their Hebrew Bible. This being admitted, let us turn to Gen. xxi. 33, where we read that "Abraham called on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God:" called on *Yehovah el olam*. On this, a learned commentator, whose authority on the meaning of a difficult word is without a rival, remarks that "this is the first place in Scripture in which *olam* occurs as an attribute of God, and here it is evidently designed to point out His eternal duration, that it can mean no *limited time* is self-evident, because nothing of the kind can be attributed to God." Now this is the word translated by αἰώνιος in the Greek of the Septuagint, and which our translators render by everlasting. If the word does not mean endless, it would then follow, as shown above, that the existence of the Deity would come to an end; but this is too monstrous a notion for any intelligent person to entertain. Let us for the sake of our edification translate it by the meaning which "J. B.'s" friends put on it, and then we shall have Abraham calling on Yehovah, the age-long, or age-lasting God! The theology which is built upon such criticism and philology is worthy of its authors.

Let us take another example. In 2 Cor. iv. 18 we read that "the things which are seen are πρόσκαιρα, temporal, but the things which are not seen are αἰώνια, eternal." The force of this passage depends on the opposition of these two Greek words, so that if the one means temporal, the other must necessarily mean endless, otherwise there is no sense in the passage. In order to see this let us substitute temporal, which is confessedly the meaning of age-long, for the second word, and then the text, will run thus: For the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are temporal! It is no wonder that scientific men smile with contempt as they listen to the talk of some professing Christians. Science, with all its hostility to the Bible, never put such an affront on it as has been done by some of its

professed friends. The comment of St. Chrysostom on this text is worthy of notice as showing the mean ing he attached to it: *τίθηναι παράλληλα τὰ παρόντα τοῖς μελλούσι, τὸ παραντίκα πρὸς τὸ αἰώνιον*.

Every person that knows how to judge of such matters, and who is not blinded by prejudice for a particular tenet, will easily perceive from the opposition in the latter clause that the meaning of the last word in the mind of the writer must have been that of endlessness. By a parity of reasoning we can show that the word must have the same meaning in many other places of the New Testament, such as the "eternal spirit," "eternal glory," and "everlasting kingdom"; but let us hasten on to the text in dispute, Matt. xxv. 46. No reason has been shown why we should not translate the second clause in the same way as the first, and then we shall have "age-long" life as the reward of the righteous! This, of course, implies that that life will come to an end! And this is the glorious prospect held out to the devotees of this system—a phantasmagorical collapse, like the Nirvana of Buddhism, or like the passing away of the "baseless fabric of a vision." All this comes to pass from that wretched philology which says that the word αἰώνιον "*never* means endless." Perhaps the words of Polycarp, the martyr, in answer to the Proconsul, when he threatened to consume him with fire, will hush to rest the controversy on this verse, as showing the meaning and use of the word: *πῦρ ἀπειλῆς τὸ πρὸς ὧραν καίμενον, καὶ μέτ' ὄλιγον σβεννύμενον; ἀγνοεῖς γὰρ τὴν μελλούσης κρίσεως καὶ αἰώνιου κολάσεως τοῖς ἀσέβεσι τηρούμενον πῦρ*. The term "age-long," though confessedly *indefinite*, may have for its meaning either a short or a long, but never an unlimited period of duration; but this last, being the original meaning, is the sense in which *aionion* should be taken, unless some reason can be shown to the contrary. There are secondary, derived, or, as they are sometimes called, accommodated meanings of words, which circumstances of subject, time, and place will enable us to find out and apply with propriety. Thus, when we read of the "everlasting hills," we know that they are not strictly everlasting, but that the word has been applied to them in a hyperbolic way. So, in the phrase "*aionion* interval," we know that an interval is a limited period, and that the writer used the accommodated meaning of the word *aionion* to express a long interval. There are these accommodated meanings in every language, and they afford no difficulty to any person, nor is any one in danger of being misled by them, except a mere tyro. Had the original meaning of the word *aionion* been that of a limited period, there would then have been a tautology in a phrase, which would have meant a *limited* limited period! There would be no sense with this meaning of the word in saying an age-long interval, because every person endowed with common sense would know that an interval must be an age of either long or short duration. So then, when there is nothing in the subject to limit its meaning, it must be taken in its unlimited sense, as in Matt. xxv. 46. But let us suppose that "age-long punishment" is the correct translation; then being an age of either long or short duration, it must *begin* at one point and *end* at another. Let it be granted that death, or the Judgment-day, is the beginning point, where then is the ending one? "J. B." does not know; what right has he then to say that there is an ending point? But for the sake of the consistency and intelligibility of his system he is bound to make known this point

which God has not revealed, and over which science has cast the mantle of silence. If he were standing at the ending point of a period and looking back over it from the beginning he might then call it an age, but to stand at the beginning point of a period of which he knows no ending, and to call it an age, is surely a misnomer. In vain is help hoped for from the notion that the punishment is remedial: because it is not remedial. How could separation from God be remedial? "Depart from me" implies the absence of *everything* remedial. The nature of the thing destroyed shows the nature of the destruction; the soul being a spiritual substance can only be destroyed spiritually; its spiritual destruction is separation from God, and separation from God is spiritual death; and how a dying condition could be called a remedial one passes human comprehension.

Further, there can be no pardon of sin without a sacrifice, and that there are some sins for which no sacrifice has been provided is evident from Heb. x. 26, 27: "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth *no more sacrifice* for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." The condition of these people, therefore, is without a remedy, their punishment is not remedial. The remedial theory therefore falls to the ground, and the whole superstructure built upon it: If "J. B." answers this letter I hope he will not say that I have "entirely misunderstood the nature of his argument," or that I have misrepresented him, or that I have been making "incorrect declarations." Because he either does or does not say what he means; if he does, then we are right in taking his words as we find them; and if he does not, then why does he write in the way he does? or why write at all? Some people look aghast at the consequences legally drawn from their own principles, and then they cry out "you have hurt me."

Neither ought he to charge me with a "tendency to impute unworthy motives," because the only motive I could possibly impute to him was that of trying to propagate these peculiar doctrines, which I believe to be untrue. And if he thinks his motive an unworthy one, why does he adopt it, or enter upon the task at all?

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, October 25th, 1889.

"THEIR DEEDS DO FOLLOW THEM."

SIR,—“Do you know, Wilfrid, I once shot a little bird—for no good, but just to shoot at something. It wasn't that I didn't think of it—don't say that. I did think of it. I knew it was wrong. When I had levelled my gun, I thought of it quite plainly, and yet I drew my trigger. It dropped a heap of ruffled feathers. I shall never get that little bird out of my head. And the worst of it is, that to all eternity, I can never make any atonement.” “But God will forgive you, Charley.” “What do I care for that,” he rejoined almost fiercely, “when the little bird cannot forgive me.”

I have just read through a book, which pretends to account for the Creation, in which the above appeared as an apt quotation from one of our modern authors. I wish, with your permission, Mr. Editor, to make a few remarks upon it.

It will still be in the memory of some of your readers that, in discussing some years ago the question of evolution, I said the object of the sympathisers with the superstition was to banish God from His world. I have to this day a vivid recollection of the storm it raised about my head. I do not think I shall ever forget it, though I do not feel any the worse for it. I have since read, amongst other books, Professor Rensch's great book “Die Bibel und die Natur.” I have seen no reason whatever to change my views. I have no intention just now to speak of the book in question, further than to remark that it makes the quotation with approval and with apparent gusto. I want to deal with the quotation itself as marking clearly the tendency of much of the writing of the present day.

The quotation, I need scarcely say, is fiction. I do not pretend to be able to affirm positively that it contains a psychological impossibility; but I do think the cases are very rare wherein it is seen that the mind approves and disapproves of an act at one and the same time. I take it that this absurdity is the chief element in accounting for its startling nature. In other words, it is chosen because it is absurd. But let this pass; we will consider its theological aspect.

The little villain had done a very wicked thing. He is angry with himself—this because the object of his cruelty cannot forgive him. It is no consolation that God will forgive him. He will only take the little bird's forgiveness. This is not forthcoming, and so he will rather bear the blame for ever. The only logical outcome of such reasoning is that he is better than God. Thus does the writer, with his tiny black hand, seek to put out the light of God's goodness.

Now God cannot forgive sin. God is as sure to take cognisance of every cruel deed as He is sure to punish it. This awful fact is too much lost sight of in our desire to make it clear that God has made away by which he can put away the guilt of our sins. The question is a long one, and I do not wish to take up your space. But I wish to raise my feeble voice in emphatic protest against these vile insinuations against the goodness of God.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Thrapston,

Oct. 26th, 1889.

P.S.—Will “Presbyter” tell us, if it be not true that we most show our gratitude to God by seeking further blessings at his hands, how we do best show that gratitude? I do feel that I cannot offer any adequate return for His many blessings beyond that of a heart ready for more. What has he besides? I am rather curious to know. He certainly fails to make out his case, to my satisfaction, that our text does not justify this teaching. What is involved, I would like to know, in confessing and worshipping the Lord, if asking further blessings be not? I must further ask “Presbyter,” seeing that he charges me with misquoting Scripture to prove his point. Let him take any one of the quotations and show that it does not involve the truth that having received blessing we do show our gratitude best by asking for more. To this, in justice to myself, I challenge him.

CHRISTIAN GRATITUDE.

SIR,—I have read with great interest and pleasure Mr. Sandland's beautiful sermon on “Christian Grati-

tude" in the PULPIT of the 19th, explaining the Divine paradox that we best show gratitude for God's goodness by asking for more blessings. Perhaps he will thank me for a text on the subject which he has not quoted—"Of his fulness have we all received, and grace for grace." The meaning of the last three words is that God's grace is not given for any deserving of ours, but for its own sake; increase of grace on account of the grace bestowed before.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 27th October, 1889.

THE Rev. Henry Shrimpton, vicar of All Saints', Stoke Newington, suggests the desirability of presenting a pastoral staff to the Bishop of London. "The crozier is used by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the metropolitan churches, so that it is meet and right that the Bishop of this diocese should be seen, especially when performing sacred functions with his Grace, using the recognised symbol of the Episcopal office."

THE Rev. W. T. Vale, vicar of Helsby, Cheshire, writing with regard to the statement recently made by the Bishop of Llandaff as to the "bees returning to the old hive," says:—"It may interest your readers to know that at a church which I built in a populous Lancashire town some years ago, and of which I was the first vicar, my curate was an ex-Congregationalist minister, the Scripture-reader had been a Primitive Methodist local preacher, and the sexton and organist had both been Congregationalists. Moreover, my next curate had been a Wesleyan minister, and he is now, I am glad to say, occupying an influential position in the dear old Church."

THE Rev. R. G. Ash, vicar of St. Paul's, Spalding, was the only applicant for the post of chaplain to the workhouse at the meeting of the Spalding Board of Guardians on Monday. Mr. Ash is a member of the board, and he tendered his resignation, expressing his regret at being compelled to take such a course, as he took much pleasure in the work. The Rev. J. C. Jones (Baptist) could not support the appointment of a paid chaplain on principle, but he did not intend to oppose Mr. Ash, of whom he held a high opinion. Mr. Donington, another Nonconformist, who is opposed to the appointment of chaplain, said if they were to have such an officer he would be glad to support Mr. Ash. A motion to appoint Mr. Ash was carried unanimously.

WHILST the number of Jews in Spitalfields and the adjacent parts is daily increasing, there is no place where the activity of missionary zeal among them is more apparent than in that parish. Emboldened by former successes, the rector of Christ Church, Spitalfields, a well-known friend of all missionary agencies, arranged for another Jewish service on Friday week. Between 400 and 500 Jews were present, in most cases, it is believed, quite ignorant of Christian teaching. The service commenced at 7 p.m. by singing a hymn, which was heartily rendered both in Mamaloshon (Judæo-Polish) and English, copies of the hymns printed in both languages having been placed in the hands of each worshipper. After the hymn a suitable service was read in German by the Rev. H. G. Rosedale, consisting of the Lord's Prayer, collect, the Decalogue, which was rendered very solemn to the Jewish mind owing to the singing of the Kyrie by the

choir. The comfortable words and a prayer for the Queen concluded the first part of the service. After another hymn, Isaiah lv. was read by Mr. M. Bergmann both in Hebrew and German. Another hymn followed, and then the Rev. Joseph Kahn, vicar of St. Stephen's, Upper Holloway, proceeded to deliver an impressive sermon to those assembled in their own language.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Beardall, Rev. John, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Saviour's, Poplar.
 Beevor, Rev. W. Sumpter, M.A., Vicar of Hundon, Suffolk; Vicar of Somersham-cum-Pidley, Fenton, and Colne.
 Carpenter, Rev. Henry S., M.A., Curate of Cowley St. John, Oxford; Vicar of Rillington, New Malton, Yorkshire.
 Cart, Rev. H. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Kentish New-town.
 Cooke, Rev. C. J. Rashleigh, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Angell-town, Brixton; Rector of Cranham, near Romford.
 Dayson, Rev. George Henry, Secretary of the Liverpool College; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
 Fisher, Rev. G. C., M.A., Vicar of Croydon, Rural Dean of Croydon.
 Foran, Rev. Thomas, Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class.
 Harrison, Rev. P. R., Chaplain, Bombay.
 Hatton, Rev. James E., Curate of East Retford; Chaplain of the New Church of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Clumber.
 Hazlerigg, Rev. W. G., M.A., Rector of Hallaton, Uppingham.
 Heathcote, Rev. Gilbert Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Harmston, Lincoln.
 Howlett, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
 Hudson, Rev. W. Clark, M.A., Senior Curate and Afternoon Lecturer, Bradford Parish Church; Clerical Superintendent of the Liverpool Church of England Scripture Readers' Society.
 Langham, Rev. J. J., M.A., Clerical Principal of the Clergy Daughters' School, Warrington; Vicar of Padgate, Warrington.
 Livett, Rev. Greville Mairis, Minor Canon of Rochester; Precentor of Rochester Cathedral.
 Maulc, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Trotton, Sussex.
 Parker, Rev. Richard, Curate of Haslingden; Vicar of the New Parish of St. John, Stonefield, Haslingden.
 Parr, Rev. Willoughby Chase, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
 Sharpe, Rev. Lancelot Lambert, B.D., Rector of Cranham, near Romford; Vicar of St. John's, Angell-town, Brixton.
 Simcox, Rev. Henry Kingdon, M.A., Rector of Patney, near Devizes; Rector of Ewelm, Wallingford.
 Sleight, Rev. W. B., M.A., Vicar of St. Catherine's, Northampton.
 Stewart, Rev. John, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Sevenoaks; Vicar of Tylehurst (St. Georges'), Reading.
 Thomas, Rev. John, Vicar of Eastleigh, Southampton.
 Thornton, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Ewell, Surrey.
 Willan, Rev. W. W., B.A., Chaplain of St. Catharine's Home, Ventnor.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Bushnell, Rev. John Hext, at Cheltenham, on the 23rd ult., aged 76.
 Corbet, Rev. John Dryden, at Sundorne Castle, Shrewsbury, on the 25th ult., aged 81.
 Gibson, Rev. Stanley Taylor, B.D., at Sandon Rectory, Chelmsford, on the 24th ult., aged 63.
 King, Rev. Joseph, Rector, formerly of Wenham Magna, at St. Martin's-by-Looe, on the 24th ult., aged 72.
 Lewis, Rev. G. T., at the Limes, Exminster, on the 21st ult., aged 73.
 Lukin, Rev. William Hugo, Rector of the Parish, at Downham Rectory, Essex, on the 26th ult., aged 60.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE PROPHECY OF MARY.

BY THE REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL,
SUNDAY, AUGUST 11TH.

"For behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath done me great things, and holy is His name. And His mercy is on them that fear Him throughout all generations."—LUKE i. 48, 49, 50.

LAST Sunday we left Mary at the end of the first strophe of her hymn, beginning to disclose the motive that had inspired the burst of praise with which she replied to the salutation of Elisabeth. All the powers of her spiritual nature, ranging from the height of pure thought to the depths of passionate emotion, were engaged like the contributory members of a great orchestra, in chanting the glory of the Eternal Being, and especially in His character of the Saviour of herself and of the whole race of mankind. But the fact which immediately prompts her song is that He, in whose sight every creature is manifest, and whose eyes in all the earth behold the evil and the good, has deigned to cast upon her a special glance of profound significance. "He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden." The blood of David flows in her veins, but for some generations the royal race has lived in seclusion, has lived among the poor, cherishing the secret of its high descent, but resigning itself to the destiny which God in His justice and His love had for the time assigned to it. The low social estate of Mary was in her eyes typical of a low spiritual estate, of a condition which could pretend to no merit in the eyes of God; but He, nevertheless, had looked upon her after such a fashion that she must needs break out into thankfulness and praise. It may be her memory was haunted by those words of a later psalmist: "He taketh the simple out of the dust, and lifteth the poor out of the mire, that he may set him with the princes, even with the princes of His people." Of herself she thinks as of the handmaiden, or to be more exact, the bondwoman of God, a slave who was simply His property, who could plead no personal rights in arrest of His will and yet what had He not done for her? In the second strophe of her hymn one startling consequence of the high honour put upon her, and the source to which it is due, and the sense in which a kindred distinction may be shared by all true

servants of God, are successively handled: "Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed, for He that is mighty hath done me great things, and holy is His name. And His mercy is on them that fear Him throughout all generations."

Mary places her finger first of all on one very startling consequence of the honour which is assigned to her as the mother of the Divine Redeemer. She will live for ever in the memory of mankind. Elisabeth had said, "Blessed art thou among women," and Mary, so far from deprecating this high estimate of her privilege, goes considerably beyond. "Behold," she exclaims, "from henceforth all generations shall congratulate me as blessed." It is true that there are in the Hebrew Scriptures sentences which Mary, when thus speaking, may have had in her mind. Thus, at the birth of Asher, his mother, Leah, exclaimed, "Happy am I, for the daughters will call me blessed," and the child's name, Asher, the happy one, expresses the feeling of the mother. And in the Book of Proverbs the children of the virtuous woman arise up and call her blessed, and Malachi predicts the day when all generations shall call her blessed. But there is nothing in these sayings which is really comparable with Mary's unique prophecy about herself, in which she anticipates the judgment of generations of living men: "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." That which must strike us in this language of hers is its boldness. She is sure of the fact which to ordinary experience seems to be beyond the range of probable conjecture; she is sure of the future. Average human common sense, looking out upon the future, declares that nothing is probable except the unforeseen, but Mary surveys the future, and she has no hesitation about what the distant ages will say about herself. "Behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." She is sure, first of all, that she will be remembered, and just let us reflect what that means. In every generation of men only a very small minority when dead is remembered. A name commonly lives on in a family for at most some three or four generations. And if a name is known to a wider circle, it may possibly be cherished in the memory for a few years; but then it dies off, and the man is forgotten. There are, of course, some few memories that survive, rulers of peoples, leaders of political parties, discoverers in art or in science, masters in literature; but you can almost count them on your fingers, and their names, too, when a century or two has gone by are often enough on their way to pass into general oblivion, even though they should linger awhile in the note-books of students or on the shelves of libraries. As a rule, all soon pass. The human life drops like a pebble into the ocean of eternity, and for a few moments there are ripples on the surface, growing fainter and fainter as the circles widen, and then, so far as this world is concerned,

the life which has passed from sight is as utterly forgotten as though it had never been lived at all.

Men fade like leaves, they drop away
Beneath the parent shade;
Others again succeed, but they
Are in oblivion laid.
So spake the Sire of Grecian Song:
Through each succeeding age,
The words are caught and borne along
By poet, saint, and sage.

This, I say, is the rule; but Mary is confident that she will be the exception to it. She is to all seeming but a poor Syrian peasant girl, and yet she dares to predict that this ordinary law of forgetfulness of the dead will be suspended in her favour.

Remember that as yet nothing has outwardly happened to warrant her confidence. No Apostle has been called to Christ, no miracle has been worked by the Christ, no one has yet heard of Christ's resurrection or of His sermon on the Mount—nay, Mary's Divine Son has not yet been born into this world of sense and time; she has only the angel's promise to fall back upon, but she is none the less sure that it is a warrant that she will live on in the memories of men to the very furthest limits of time.

But Mary is not only sure of a place in the memories of men. She knows that as she is remembered she will be congratulated on her blessedness as long as her memory shall last. Reflect that when a memory survives it often is only to be associated with a very different judgment from that which was once accorded to it. A time comes when all who influence living men and women have passed away, and the dead can only be studied in documents, such documents as may chance to be still in existence. And then a reputation is cast into the crucible of what is called criticism, which constantly, under the guise of impartiality, ministers to the passions or the prejudices of the contemporary world.

Criticism, indeed, is sometimes just; it destroys unworthy idols and it redresses the injustice of contemporaries; but it is a very uncertain guide to absolute truth, and it illustrates by its capricious activity the point on which I am insisting—it shows how transient may be a high earthly reputation. Scarcely any two writers who have discussed him during the last seventy years have been agreed as to the merits or demerits of the first Napoleon, and if, to go nearer to our present subject, we recall the names of women who have figured on the scene of human history—Semiramis, Zenobia, the Countess Matilda, Catherine de Medici, Elizabeth of England, Mary Stuart of Scotland, Maria Theresa of Austria, Catherine II. of Russia—how various have been the world's judgments about them. But of this vacillation in the opinion of the world Mary has no apprehension whatever. Filled with the spirit of prophecy, she looks down the long procession of ages, with its unceasing

vicissitudes of races and of nations, and she is sure that her name will ever carry with it associations which must ensure for it a universal welcome. "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." And is she not right? Nearly nineteen centuries have passed since she spoke; and who is there that knows anything, be he a believer or a man of average information interested only in the concerns which affect our race, who has not heard of Mary? A man cannot help hearing of her, so conspicuously does she loom on the page of history. True enough it is that around the solid records respecting her in the Gospels, religious imagination has been unwontedly busy. Early in the history of Christendom there were documents still existing, which the Early Church rejected as apocryphal, in which her birth and infancy and the ministerial functions supposed to have been accorded to her after her death, are elaborated with a license which might perhaps have been pardonable in poetry if only it had not been treated as prose. Into this vast subject it is not consistent with my present purpose to enter; suffice it to say that whatever the exaggerations and legends which have thus gathered around the name of Mary, they cannot obscure the greatness which is assigned to her in the pages of the Gospel, while they illustrate, even in their wildest forms, the place which she herself claimed to occupy—the place which she ever since has occupied—in the minds of men. Compare Mary from this point of view with some of the great ladies who were nearly or exactly her contemporaries. While Mary was fetching water in a pitcher day by day from the well of Nazareth, or gathering fruit and wood on the hill above the village, these stately dames, surrounded by a crowd of slaves, swept proudly through the halls of the Cæsars. Their crimes or their misfortunes were the talk of the civilised world; but, if we except here and there some professed student of history, what do men know about them to-day? What do you know about Livia, who parted from an honourable husband that she might be the wife of Augustus; or of Julia, the ill-used daughter of Augustus, the wife of Tiberius; or of Octavia, the sister of Augustus, whom Antony divorced that he might marry Cleopatra; or Antonia, the high-minded daughter of Octavia, who lived, they say, only to be poisoned by her grandson Caligula; or of the empresses—better perhaps unmentioned in a Christian Church—who are associated with the courts of Claudius and Nero? The names of these ladies were once as familiar to the vast population of the Empire as are to ourselves the members of any Royal Family in Europe; but who, except a few students, knows anything whatever about them now? They filled for a few short years the thoughts, they supplied material for the gossips of the world, and now they are, for all practical purposes, utterly forgotten, while the lowly maiden who was living unknown in a remote

province of that vast Empire which was ruled by their nearest relatives is at this hour more remembered by civilised men than any other member of her sex who ever lived.

But what is the justification of this astonishing confidence on the part of Mary that she will be remembered as blessed to the utmost limits of time? It is not anything that she had previously achieved; it is not any grace or excellence peculiar to her mind and character. That she was personally endowed with graces of the highest excellence and beauty we may be well assured. In coming among us the Eternal Son would by His grace make ready a fitting temple prepared for Himself. But Mary dwells on nothing of this kind, nothing that is personal to herself; she only knows that she has been the recipient of a privilege conferred upon her by the free bounty of her Creator: "He that is mighty hath done me great things, and holy is His name." She refers, of course, to what was implied in the message of the angel Gabriel at the Annunciation: "Hail, thou that are highly favoured! the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women." "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God. And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David. And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end."

And in answer to Mary's expression of wonder, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

Mary had received this assurance in submissive faith: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word."

And these assurances were the warrant of the confidence she expressed. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, if she was to be the mother of the Heir of David's throne and promises, if He who was to be born of her was in virtue of the supernatural conditions of His birth to be recognised as the Son of God? Nothing which she had done or could have done, nothing that she was or could have been, could have merited this extraordinary distinction, and Mary is bent upon ascribing it unreservedly to God: "He that is mighty hath magnified me, and holy is His name." Be careful to observe that not once in the *Magnificat* does Mary let fall one single word which points to a sense on her part of personal desert or excellence. Her joy is that "He that is mighty hath done great things to me," and she adds, "Holy is His name." She does not understand why she should have been singled out for such high honour; but she is sure that since He wills it all must be well. Elisabeth had wondered that Mary does not repudiate the

honour; to have done so would have been to make little of God's astonishing bounty; but she insists that whatever she is, she is by the grace and bounty of God, and in this respect is on a level with all His creatures. And in this respect, brethren, is she not an example to an age like ours, which has no very robust faith in the presence or the gifts of God, but does pay even exceptional homage to the merits or accomplishments of individual men? Even the modern Church of Christ has not wholly escaped a disposition to dwell more lightly on the gift of a sacred office than on the man who happens to hold it, or on the commission which is received from Christ, and which is common to the holder with all his brethren, and to devote exceptional attention to anything that is strictly peculiar to the man, anything that can be supposed to be the product of man's own character or industry. It may be that we of the clergy have not always been sufficiently on our guard against this fatal tendency to disparage the commission which Christ has given us in the interests of some fancied or real endowments of our own. Any such mistake as this is tacitly rebuked by Mary in her *Magnificat*. She never leads us to think for a moment of what she personally is; we do not for one moment forget that she is by office the mother of the Redeemer. Indeed, when we review the terms in which she refers to her privilege, it is impossible not to be struck with their guarded and reserved tone: "He hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden; for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath done to me great things."

We wonder, perhaps, that she is not more explicit; that knowing what she must know of her extraordinary place in the order of Divine Providence, she does not say more about it, does not at least in outline describe what it is. "He that is mighty hath done to me great things." An ordinary Christian, we say to ourselves, might say as much after recovering from a dangerous illness or after a spiritual change which has altered profoundly all his views and purposes in life. Mary is to be the mother of the Eternal Son, she is, as the Christian poet of our time says, with literal truth, "Favoured beyond Archangel's dream." And yet she might seem to desire to throw a veil over her prerogatives by phrases which, while implying in her mouth something extraordinary, yet convey no definite idea of what it is. Can we venture in any way to account for this? It would seem, my brethren, that here Mary is teaching us the duty of speaking very sparingly of any blessing peculiar to ourselves, which we may have reason to believe God has conferred upon us individually.

This does not apply to the general principles of Christian experience. We can never be mistaken, when a good opportunity offers, on insisting on the power of prayer, or the value of the example of religious friends, or the instruction and encourage-

ment to be gained from Holy Scripture, or the grace and the efficacy of Christian sacraments. We can never be wrong in touching on those truths which are the common inheritance of Christians—the reality of our Lord's love for us, making atonement for us on the Cross, making intercession for us in the heights of heaven, the incalculable issues of every human life, the nearness and the reality of the eternal world. To say what we may with sincerity and with reverence on these high subjects is indeed to praise God in His holiness, to praise Him in the firmament of His power, to praise Him in His noble acts, and according to His excellent greatness; but when we come to matters which touch us, and us alone, to blessings which we only have received, to experiences which, as far as we know, have been shared by no others, the case is very different. As to these, the best rule is to say nothing at all about them if we can help it, or, if we must say something, to say as little as possible. That God does at times visit one particular soul as He visits no others, can hardly be doubted. The Bible teaches us that He does so in a variety of ways, and Christian experience has always been in accord with this teaching of Scripture. These favours or gifts to individuals are very various indeed; they are suited to the needs or temperaments of those who receive them, they cannot be catalogued or reduced to a system. Sometimes God gives to a soul a peculiar satisfaction and joy in prayer, sometimes a vivid sense of His presence, in times of anxiety or trouble, sometimes a keen and clear presentiment of the blessedness of the world to come. There is no question here of communications made, whether in prayer or otherwise, to a single soul for the sake of others, as when during that stormy night in the Mediterranean the Lord stood by His servant Paul, and assured him of the safety of himself and of his fellow-voyagers. But it may happen that things may pass between God and the soul which have no reference to others, as when our Lord encouraged St. Paul in a vision at Corinth, or strengthened him in his second imprisonment at Rome. Such things may take place to-day in any Christian life; but there is a great reason why those who have received them, or think they have received them, should say as little about them as they may. For, first of all, there is always the possibility that what looks like a spiritual visitation, endowment, or grace, especially if it be of an unusual character, may be in truth some allusion of a purely natural emotion. That such illusions do exist is no less certain than the existence of the spiritual grace or gifts they counterfeit. And next, supposing there is no element of illusion at all, the soul cannot but suffer if it displays its treasures in an ostentatious temper, and the danger of such ostentation is a very subtle one, and may exist when least suspected. And then, thirdly, there is the ever-present risk of exaggeration in the common form of giving outline

and distinctness to something very indefinite. Probably we have all heard of meetings of earnest people in which first one and then another member of the company has related his experiences. If those experiences were strictly confined to sins, such meetings might be very improving. In the Early Church of Christ, Christians confessed their sins in public, and such confession, it need scarcely be said, was a very good lesson in the difficult work of learning to be really humble and really sincere. But to talk in public of any tokens of God's special favour towards us, or, still more, about our good points, even if our estimate of them is accurate, is surely very dangerous—dangerous to those graces of truthfulness and self-forgetfulness which are in the Christian life of almost more account than anything else. I do not say that no occasion can ever arise to justify a departure from this rule. One such occasion we know did present itself in the lifetime of St. Paul. He had been traduced by opponents at Corinth as a scheming, unspiritual man, who was really working against Christ's older Apostles, Peter and James, and who had acted as he did because, unlike them, he knew he had never witnessed such a sight as the Transfiguration—the vision of Christ in His glory. His own reputation and his whole work for Jesus Christ at Corinth was imperilled, and therefore very reluctantly, he partially, but only partially, withdrew the veil from an occurrence of which, but for the ill-natured gossip of the Corinthians, we should never have heard. In doing this he only half admits that he is the subject of his own narrative; he refers to the receiver of the singular distinction which he records as if he were, or might be, some one other than himself: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell—God knoweth), such an one caught up to the third heaven; and I knew such a man (whether in the body or out of the body, I cannot tell—God knoweth), how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Of such an one will I glory; yet of myself will I not glory, but in mine infirmities."

We see how a reference to this striking passage in his life was wrung out of the soul of the unwilling Apostle by sheer pressure of spiritual necessity, and something of the same kind must have been the case with the Blessed Virgin when, for the honour of her Son, and to promote the true and full knowledge of His eternal Gospel, she communicated, as she must have communicated, to the Evangelist St. Luke the exact details of what passed between herself and the angel at the Annunciation. While acknowledging Elisabeth's congratulations she is under no such pressing necessity, and therefore, quite deliberately she veils what has happened under more general terms, the terms in the *Magnificat* which I have just been alluding to.

It is a point of spiritual wisdom to know how to say enough to give God His due, and yet not so much as to feed that subtle self-approbation which is one of the worst foes of the true well-being of man.

Mary concludes the second strophe of her hymn by lines which lead our thoughts away from God's dealings with herself to a general law of His providence: "His mercy is on them that fear Him, from generation to generation." And yet in these words she may be well classing herself among those who fear God, and whom God in consequence visits with His mercy, whatever form the visitation may take. By fear she means that sincere and awe-struck apprehension of the presence and the majesty of God which is the beginning of all spiritual wisdom, since without it the soul can take no true measure either of itself or of what is due to the author and the end of its existence. Such fear may come to co-exist with love, although love in such degree as it becomes perfect love expels from fear the element of terror while preserving a reverent and watchful apprehension. It is in this sense that perfect love casteth out fear. Fear and love are the two guardians of the higher life of the human soul, and God never fails to help and strengthen those whom He brings up in His steadfast fear and love. Mary then shows by what took place at the Annunciation that she had this fear, or reverent apprehension, of God deep in her heart, that she was looking out for the intimations of His will, and, as the consequence, His mercy lies upon her in making her the mother of His Son. But the same law of His action would hold good for all coming time. Not by the natural works of righteousness which man had done, but according to His mercy would Jesus Christ our Lord save men from their sins. And this mercy would be accorded to those who had in their hearts to start with that sensitiveness to what was amiss in them which some apprehension of what God is alone can give. So it was with those early believers who waited for the consolation of Israel; so it has been with every soul which has come in adult life out of the darkness of heathenism or the darkness of modern unbelief to the knowledge and love of Christ. To the end of time He is the dispenser to the human race of the infinite mercy of God, and He dispenses it to those, and those only, who begin with fear.

But Mary's words have another and a deeper meaning. It is that for the endless well-being of the soul the earliest stirrings of life which are due to Divine influence, and which we call respectively fear and love, are more important than any religious privileges, more important not in themselves but to us, because without them the greatest religious privileges are like seed that is dropped into the desert—they cannot bear fruit, they cannot do anything really for us. We may dare to say that even to Mary it was more important that she

should have the fear of God in her heart, than she should be the mother of the Incarnate Son, since our Lord Himself has told us so. You remember that striking scene in after years, when one of a crowd of eager listeners around Him, in a transport of enthusiasm, essayed to win His heart by reference to the blessedness of His mother. What was His answer? He does not disparage, much less does He deny, the high standing and privilege of His mother Mary; but He insists that both for her the more important is the temper of obedient fear which alone makes any privilege other than dangerous: "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it. He does not here imply that His mother did not satisfy this condition of true blessedness; we are told, indeed, that she kept in view all God's providential dealings towards her, and pondered them in her own heart; but he would direct attention away from religious privilege, however mingled with those vital conditions without which no spiritual privilege can be turned to any good account whatever. We can never afford to lose sight of this truth. A human mind is constantly tempted to think the possession of special religious opportunity is of itself a warrant of religious security for time and for eternity, but nothing is less true. A man may be an Apostle and yet a Judas; he may be a companion of Apostles and yet a Demas; he may be a receiver of graces and blessings continually—receive at the throne of God the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood—and yet he may eat and drink his own condemnation. What is of vital importance is not warm and excited feelings—these are often enough full of illusion—but that sensitiveness of conscience to the will and presence of God which the Bible calls fear.

And thus even in the presence of the greatest religious distinction that ever was conferred on a human being, we are led to reflect that, after all, religion is the greatest equalising force in this human world. We know how great are the inequalities between human lives, and they are due to causes which are rooted in the nature of things, and which are always operating, so that if they could be suppressed by legal enactment to-morrow they would re-appear in the course of time. The rich and the poor, the powerful and the defenceless, the honoured and the neglected, will be found in human society to the end of time, for the simple reason that men enter life with very different equipment of natural powers, and this difference will certainly express itself in consequences beyond. Men of large and warm hearts, who have dwelt constantly and even bitterly on the social and other inequalities of life, have sought to find redress for these in Nature or in books. "Whatever be our position in life," they say, "we are all equally free to enjoy a writer like Shakespeare, and as we read him we are all, monarchs or working men, on a

level before his genius and insight. Whatever be our position in life we are all equally free to enjoy Nature, the outline of the great mountain, the first burst of spring, the glorious autumnal sunset, the mystery of the heavens on a clear night—all these are our own property." Yes, to a certain extent this is true; but to enjoy the masterpieces of literature at least a certain education is needed; those who would enjoy Nature are not always free enough or wealthy enough to seek her where she may be seen to the best advantage. It is otherwise with those elementary and closely related movements of the human soul upon which God shapes His mercy, and which are the first steps, as they are the crowning accomplishment, of a truly religious life. Every single human heart may fear and may love the God who made it. Religious instruction and religious opportunities are indeed precious, and where they are within reach fear and love will conspire to make the very most of them, since assuredly they cannot be neglected; but if they are not to be had, if there is a fear of God in the heart there most assuredly is His mercy too, and where there is the love of the perfect moral being, there is also within reach a presence in the soul which may even compare with that which was vouchsafed to Mary. Only one woman could be the mother of the Most Holy One; but there is no reason why each and all of us should not know by intimate experience what the Apostle meant by that astonishing yet most blessed saying, "Christ in you the hope of glory."

A PASTOR'S FAREWELL.

BY THE REV. C. A. MOLONY, M.A.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF ST. LAURENCE, THANET, ON SEPTEMBER 29TH., 1889.

"I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."—ACTS. xx. 32.

THIS is the last Sunday, dear brethren, on which I shall be privileged to address you from this pulpit as your vicar. When a minister is about to give up the charge of a flock among whom he has laboured for a number of years, he naturally, like St. Paul on leaving Ephesus, looks back and looks forward. A humiliating consciousness of much weakness, and of many shortcomings, makes him look back with trembling. How often he has failed in his duty as a messenger of Christ! In how many instances has valuable time been wasted in trifling talk about things temporal when eternal interests ought to have been pressed upon the hearer? How often has the word in season, or the timely rebuke, been omitted? How much work has been left undone,

how many opportunities have been missed. Even if he has taken the advice of the Apostle, and "made full proof of his ministry," how much of imperfection, and of negligence, has been mixed up with it all? And yet, notwithstanding all this, some fruit there will be. Having received this ministry we faint not. We may feel discouragements—what minister does not? But we do not despond. We know that "our labour shall not be in vain in the Lord." If we have sown good seed, though it may have been with tears, we "shall doubtless come again with joy, and bring our sheaves with us." As the husbandman stands in the midst of a green crop in the spring, and thinks of all that has past since he put in the seed in the autumns—the long winter months in which there appeared to be no growth, the deep snow, the chilling frost, the keen winds, the various kinds of blight that have come and gone, he recognises in the healthy aspect of the crop before him the ordinances, and the loving kindness of the Almighty giver of all good, Who is leading on the *faith* of his servant to look forward to the crowning goodness of the year, namely, the assurance to all mankind of a supply of food for all during another annual period. And so he gathers hope from the past, and looks forward to a plentiful harvest. The thoughts of the sower of the word of God are the same. "In due season we shall reap if we faint not."

But an interval there must be between such a review of our work and the harvest—an interval that must be filled with the labour of others; they must attend to the tillage after we are removed; they will enter into our labours, and will reap the fruits which we do not see. May God grant it. May the harvest be an hundredfold to the glory of His name! The sowers need not fear lest they should be forgotten. We, in our turn, have been profited by the labours of others who have preceded us. Neither will they be forgotten or overlooked. The Lord Jesus will reward them for their toil as He will reward us. The sower and the reaper shall rejoice together. "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour."

As regards ourselves, then, we, the ministers of Christ, may rely upon such encouragements and feel hopeful. Yet we cannot help feeling anxious about those who have been committed to our care for a time, and are yet "in the flesh." Will they stand firm in the faith, increasing in holiness, in sanctification, in the knowledge of God and of his Christ? No human foresight can prophesy thus much. But there is one sure source of confidence to turn to. Even an inspired Apostle, who *did* announce to the Ephesian Church some of their future trials, could find no surer ground of confidence for himself than this: "I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

Let us meditate for a short time upon his words. St. Paul commended the Ephesians to God as his first source of confidence and hope.

In any perplexity or danger the thoughts of man turn first to God, if he has any knowledge of Him, or of His ways, even when his heart is hardened by sin, and rejects God's offers of salvation.

A most touching story to this effect comes to us from America. A Christian minister was on a journey through the back woods of a recently settled district and had lost his way. Suddenly he found himself in a clearing, where a group of men were gathered round a speaker in their midst, listening eagerly to his words. As he too listened he recognised the voice; his attention was arrested by what he heard, and he drew nearer. The speaker was endeavouring to persuade the others, by every argument that he could think of, that there is no God, ridiculing such a doctrine as an antiquated and exploded idea. The traveller fastened his horse to a tree and waited until the speech was ended. Then, stepping forward, he asked the audience to listen for a few moments to him, and narrated how, two or three days before, while travelling along the banks of the neighbouring river, he had heard urgent cries for help, and with much difficulty succeeded in rescuing from drowning the man who had just addressed them. "And that same man," he continued, "who has now been trying to make you believe that there is no God, and blasphemed His Holy Name, in the hour of his peril and in the fear of death, was most profuse and loud in his supplications to God for mercy, and forgiveness, and deliverance."

Yes, in the nature of God there are just those attributes and qualities which are fitted to bring, not conviction only to those who know him not, but full confidence in every hour of need or discouragement to all who love and worship Him.

In contrast with all that we see around us, God's immutability and eternity stand out as a strong refuge. We are surrounded by change and decay. Nothing retains for long its original colour; nothing is durable. The strongest buildings may last for hundreds of years like our venerable Church, but they require to be repaired from time to time as we have experienced; the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, the majestic trees perish with age; the mountains crumble, and are worn away by the influences of the weather; man goeth to his long home; the world waxeth old; God alone is immutable, and changes not; He is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever; His mercy and His love are always the same, seeking to do good to the children of men. "I know the thoughts that I think towards you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace and not of evil." It is because the divine "compassions fail not that we are not consumed; they are new every morning." In contrast with the universal decay

around us, God alone is eternal. "From everlasting to everlasting Thou art God." "He is the Rock," a durable foundation on which to build our hopes.

Next, He is Almighty, not merely in His government of the world; not merely in making all things, both animate and inanimate, submissive to his will—the stars in their heavenly courses, the foaming sea, the stormy wind; or the fury of nations, and the violence of wicked men—all these are controlled by Him; but He is Almighty in the still small voice of His Holy Spirit, calming the unruly passions of sinful men, quickening them to a new life of holiness, and establishing them in the faith until they come unto His everlasting kingdom. This is the very Being to whom ministers, when removed from their flocks, would desire to commit them, an Almighty, everlasting Father, who "is able to keep His children from falling, and to present them faultless before the throne of His glory with exceeding joy."

And then there is the further assurance that God will never fail his saints; in health and sickness, in prosperity and adversity, in joy or sorrow, in victory or in defeat, He will watch over you. He will not suffer you to be too much elated by the one or depressed by the other. Has He not said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." Was it not St. Paul's own consolation concerning his beloved Philippians that he was "confident of this very thing, that He which had begun a good work in them would finish it until the day of Jesus Christ."

The second ground of confidence upon which St. Paul built his hopes for the salvation of his Ephesian converts was "the word of God's grace," and its power in this particular connection, as being "able to build them up, and to give them an inheritance among all them that are sanctified."

By "the word of God's grace" St. Paul meant, no doubt, the Gospel and the Scriptures. He had just before spoken of "the Gospel of the grace of God." By these words we are to understand the free proclamation of the unmerited favour of God towards sinners declared in the Scriptures and brought into the world by His Son Jesus Christ. In this act especially "God commendeth his love towards us, in that *while we were yet sinners*, Christ died for us." "God *so* loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This was the the greatest gift that even God could bestow upon men; and He freely *gave Him up* for us all.

And this word of God's grace is as effectual for the purpose for which it was ordained as it is free. "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." It is intended for universal acceptance. "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Look now at its power in this particular connection.

"The word of God's grace is able to build you up." The believer is compared to a temple. First, there must be a foundation; and God has prepared and pointed out a suitable foundation. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Each Christian character is composed of graces and gifts built up and added one to another on the foundation of faith in Christ, like the stones in a temple. And each grace has been first set into that character by God, and afterwards moulded, and beautified, and polished by his own hand. St. Peter exhorts: "Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren, nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

How does "the word of God's grace build us up?" By our studying the written word with prayer for the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Read it much. Read it daily. Do not grow tired of reading the same passages over and over again. Meditate upon it. Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it. If you come to statements or doctrines that puzzle you, ask for more light to be given to you. Pray often, "that which I see not teach Thou me." And light will be given to you as you need it. If there should be still parts which you fail to understand after all your efforts, take these upon trust. Were they not written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? Fall back upon the faith which is to be the foundation of your Christian character, in order that "the word being mixed with faith" may be profitable unto you.

Yet another step there is beyond this. "The word of God's grace is able to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." If this be true, then heaven must be a place prepared for a people who are prepared for it. So it is. If this inheritance is reserved only for those who are sanctified, and gathered out of a larger number, there must remain another class to be dealt with, the unsanctified. There must be a marked line of division, of distinction, of separation between these two classes. There will be a universal "resurrection both of the just and of the unjust," of those who are justified in Christ Jesus, and of others who are not justified in Him, of the sanctified and of the unsanctified. This much has been revealed in the Scriptures.

On which side of that line will you, the members of my flock, stand in that day? Will you stand among the sanctified? or among the unsanctified and *excluded*?

The Lord Jesus wept over Jerusalem. "If thou

hadst known in this thy day the things which belong unto thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes." And ministers weep now over Christless, faithless souls. But, thank God, the day of grace for this parish is *not* closed yet. Therefore to any present who may not have heard my voice before, or to whom I may not have yet spoken with sufficient point and clearness, I would declare once more with the most urgent entreaty, Christ has died for *your* sins; nay, He is risen again for *your* justification; He pleadeth for you, even *you*, at the right hand of God. Heaven's gate is open to you this day. Repent, and believe, and be saved; for why will ye die? Why will you not seek for an inheritance among all them which are sanctified?

Brethren, what better blessing can I leave with you than this? "I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified."

BISHOP BLYTH, of Jerusalem, is announced to give an Address to City men at St. Margaret's, Lothbury, on Monday next, at 1 o'clock p.m., on (1) "The Present Gathering of the Jews in Palestine;" and (2) on "The Attitude of the Churches of the East."

CANON LUCKOCK's lectures on the Intermediate State, at Cambridge, have evidently attracted a great deal of attention not only in the University, but also in the town. Conversation on the topic reveals an extraordinary amount of ignorance and misapprehension of this article of the Christian faith; there is every reason to believe that the work which he is doing in illustrating this doctrine will be most useful, and will enable many people to recognise the importance and force of Scriptural allusions to this topic.

THE approaching completion of the Roman church in Cambridge is viewed with much apprehension by many people, who fear that it may become a centre of proselytising work among the younger members of the University. The Master of Corpus appears to share this fear, and at a recent meeting of the Church of England Young Men's Society denounced Roman Mariolatry, and detailed some personal experiences of his own at an ordination at the Lateran. By condescending to particulars he exposed himself to a very forcible reply, as it was made plain that from want of familiarity with the Italian pronunciation of Latin he had concluded that certain prayers were addressed to the Virgin Mary when a very little inquiry would have enabled him to discover that this was not the case. Dr. Scott, the Roman priest in Cambridge, was not slow to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered, and exposed Dr. Perowne's blunder with crushing effect. If the incident serves as a lesson to Protestant champions it need not be a matter of regret. The published correspondence suggests many curious questions as to the ethics of controversy and the nature of an apology.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE	Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to MR. C. B. HARNESSE. Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his New Medical Work, entitled "Harnesse's Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harnesse's Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. MR. C. B. HARNESSE also gives Advice (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible. 52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (Corner of Rathbone Place.)
---	---

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1889.

LABOUR AND EXERCISE.—No. II.

YOUNG men ought not to be closely confined and at the same time very hard worked at either manual or mental labour. Attention to these matters is repaid by length of days and greater usefulness and vigour in later life ; and under any circumstances, amusement and frequent change of air, good at all times and for all classes, are especially necessary for the young. Persons employed in shops and factories should live some reasonable distance from their work, and never, when it can be avoided, on the spot where they work. A walk, morning and evening, is of service to them, and it is often found that over-worked and unhealthy clerks get stronger and healthier when they remove their residences to such a distance from their offices that they can enjoy a short walk several times a day. Heavy work should not, as a rule, begin in the morning until a comfortable meal is taken. In the middle of the day a substantial meal is necessary, and food should never, whatever the excuse, be hastily eaten. It is bad policy to hurry through meals. The best advice Mr. Gladstone ever gave was to bite our meat thirty-two times.

The place of employment calls for thought. The workroom or office ought not to be small, but whether small or large, should be well ventilated. In the former case this is not easy, as draughts can hardly be avoided ; that shows the importance of large rooms. It would often pay employers to attend to these matters, and to lay out a good deal of money upon them. Nothing is more ridiculous than to say that any kind of place will do for an office or a workroom. The heavy outlay incurred

in building large, convenient workshops, would be defrayed by the work done, and the better health of the workpeople.

Persons compelled to stand while working, and to use the muscles of the whole body, are usually healthier than those who sit in an unnatural and cramped position, and it is especially important that the latter should, whether fine or wet, hot or cold, walk a mile or two, morning or evening.

The employment chosen ought not to unduly tax the health and strength of the labourer. Light occupations should be allowed to the small and weak, while unhealthy employments and those requiring great bodily strength should only be undertaken by the robust. Hard though it may seem to condemn them to such a life, it is the healthy who ought to choose indoor work, while the feeble and unhealthy should, far oftener than now, work in the fields or in the open air.

Shop work is notoriously unhealthy : it is due to the heat and bad ventilation of such places, and to the number of hours of confinement, but it is inexcusable that respectable tradesmen should keep their shops open fourteen or fifteen hours a day. There is no necessity for such a thing, besides it is barbarous to confine assistants and apprentices so many hours. Labour, instead of a pleasure, becomes a burden.

Of all forms of exercise walking is, under most circumstances, the least useful, unless in the company of friends whose pursuits are somewhat different, so that the conversation does not return to topics already sufficiently engrossing the attention. For example, it is better that a clergyman and a merchant should go out together for a stroll, than that both should select members of their own calling, although in the latter case congeniality of taste and similarity of occupation would give many men additional topics of conversation, and members of the same calling are attracted to one another. Riding, shooting, and fishing are admirable ; but some purely manual employment, such as a lawn tennis, is better. A large garden is a capital field for exercise, and in digging and working in it for two or three hours a day, four or five times a week, abundant pleasure and health would be found. In great towns, where gardening is impossible, clergymen and lawyers need not be ashamed of a little carpentry, or chopping up the wood for the fire. These, of course, are only crude suggestions, but the great fact to be borne in mind is that some kind of manual labour is important to every individual. The constant change and variety of occupation attaching to the theatrical profession is alleged to be the true cause why nearly all our actors and actresses attain to an extreme old age. Certainly they do this in spite of extremely irregular hours, and often of scanty and precarious means of living.

Those are miserable creatures who make what they call pleasure their occupation, and throw away

their lives in selfish and sensual pursuits. They squander the precious years of youth, and often prematurely end their days in disease and disappointment. Every man, whatever his fortune and rank, should in youth, at any rate, follow some profession or occupation. All labour is honourable. In every sphere of life, and in every part of the world, useful work is possible; but care should be taken, when the opportunity offers, to select a suitable occupation. No absurd notions as to the dignity of a profession, should make a fond parent consign his son to an employment in which few succeed. Better to be a respectable and hard-working grocer, printer, butcher, or draper, than a poverty-stricken and disappointed clergyman or doctor.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." November, 1889. London; Hodder and Stoughton.

WE should be more inclined simply to thank Professor Milligan for his paper on "The Apostle John" than in any way to criticise it; except for one remark therein which has suggested to us, perhaps, more than it expresses. Rightly does the professor say that "It was not in action that (St. John's) strength lay;" and rightly also does he speak of Salome as "one of those mothers in Israel to whose example and training the world has so often owed its greatest benefactors and its noblest heroes." And when he speaks of her request for her sons, recorded in St. Matthew xx. 21, he says, rightly, that it was no "act of proud ambition," but one suggested by "zeal for her children's good." Was it not even something more definite? Did she not feel like Martha felt about Mary; and like hundreds and hundreds of excellent people feel in this fussy age which is much too busy to have any leisure to think—namely, that, St. John at least, even if not St. James, was wasting his time with his "notions," and that a seat on Christ's right hand or left would give him something practical to set about; *therefore* she made her request in the same excellent, well-meaning, mistaken spirit in which Martha made hers? We do not wish to impute this idea to Professor Milligan; perhaps he might repudiate it; but his words have suggested it to us.

Mr. George Adam Smith begins his review of Recent Literature on the Old Testament with the words, "A single phrase sums up the tendency of most of the recent German literature on the Old Testament—in the wake of Wellhausen." Does it really? We can believe him. But we would sooner believe that the "Times" employed the notorious Pigott, in the "pious opinion" that forged letters would help the government, than that Ezra, Nehemiah, Ezekiel and others "piously" invented Moses and the Levitical legislation. For the former theory, however absurd, is at least possible, or rather, not impossible in the nature of things; the latter is both absurd and impossible. And so also we have excused ourselves from reading Dean Chadwick's article thereon; we will wait patiently till this tyranny be overpast.

Canon Cheyne writes most excellently on Ps. lxxvii.

—if we were Germans we could prove conclusively that there are two Canon Cheynes, but being only English, our capabilities are limited; and the review of Dr. Habb's "Essays in Biblical Greek" is very interesting. Altogether an exceedingly good number of the Expositor.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I had a far higher opinion of Mr. Murphy than to think he would willingly misrepresent me. In a former letter he charged me with want of courtesy, and because I tried in my reply to show that no discourtesy was intended, and to point out the futility of using that as a plea for his unsound reasoning, he now, in his letter to the PULPIT of the 19th inst., says that I made an attack on *him*. Your readers can judge how far his language is warranted by the facts of the case. I made no attack on him, because I did not like to hurt him. I consider him an estimable person in many ways, and would think more of him if he understood what is meant by a demonstration. In order to make matters clear on this point between him and me, it may be well to observe that when we perceive the agreement or disagreement of two ideas by means of one or more other intervening ideas, we are then said to use a demonstration. Take, for instance, the following syllogism as an example. Everything that God says is true; that the wicked will receive everlasting punishment is one of the things which God says; therefore the everlasting punishment of the wicked is a true doctrine. Here, by the intervention of the true sayings of God as a third idea, with which the other two are compared, we can predicate of the everlasting punishment of the wicked that it is a true doctrine. Mr. Murphy has shown no reason why other truths of a "spiritual order" cannot be thus demonstrated; indeed, the very opposite of this is the truth, as can be shown by numerous examples from St. Paul's Epistles. It would be a very interesting study for Mr. Murphy to find out how often he uses the preposition "*for*" in his Epistle to the Romans, because he is on those occasions generally giving a reason or proof for what he had previously said. But let us take for our mutual edification what he says in Heb. xi. 1: "Faith is the *evidence* of things not seen." Here a truth of a very high order, namely, the existence of an invisible, spiritual world, is demonstrated through the intervention of faith. Faith is the evidence, proof, demonstration, or *ελεγχος* of things unseen. It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Murphy's habits of thought are not only not consonant with those of the Apostle, but directly opposed to them. When the Apostle says, "Prove all things" (1 Thess. v. 21), Mr. Murphy says: "No, we must not prove all things, for Matthew Arnold says, 'Truth is not to be proved, but to be seen'!" His disposition to believe things without proof is the reason why he does not see that ver. 32 of Romans xi. makes entirely for my side of the case, and so far from the interpretation being a strained one, it is the opinion of the best commentators. Let us listen to one of them in the following quotation: "They (the Jews) are represented here as being

accused of their transgressions, tried at God's bar, found guilty on being tried, condemned to the death they had merited, remanded to prison till the sovereign will relative to their execution should be announced, *shut* or *locked* up under the jailer *unbelief*, and there awaiting the execution of their sentence. But God in His compassion caused a general pardon to be proclaimed to all. The Jews have refused to receive this pardon on the terms which God has proposed it, and therefore continue *locked up* under *unbelief*. The Gentiles have welcomed the offers of grace, and are delivered out of their prison. But as the offers of grace continue to be made to all *the time will come* when the Jews will also lay hold on the hope set before them, and thus become with *the Gentiles one flock* under one shepherd and bishop of all their souls." In a former letter Mr. Murphy wrote, "All enemies shall be abolished." I corrected him by saying, "Shall have put all enemies under His feet." He now admits the justice of my correction by quoting the text in the latter way, but he still clings to the idea of "abolishing," as if that will do him any good. Whatever the Apostle's meaning may be, it must be gathered from the context; and that teaches us that he is there speaking of the general resurrection, so that Christ abolishes death by raising all mankind, never to die again, so far as their bodies are concerned. But as the general resurrection *precedes* the general judgment, it cannot alter what takes place at the latter. Accordingly, we are told by our Saviour that some shall come forth to the "resurrection of damnation." This surely does not look like abolishing (in the sense that Mr. Murphy understands the word) "the sum total and consequences of sin." It just leaves the question where it was. The nicety of a translation consists in giving to a word the meaning that just fits it. As our Lord was never a bondservant nor a slave, the translation which makes Him either one or the other cannot be correct. With propriety, therefore, the Revised Version follows the Authorised, and translates it a "servant." St. Paul's "form of a servant" is explained by our Lord's own words: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Mr. Murphy says he did not apply the term "Mahomedan theology" to Ephes. i. 11, but to my use of that text. My use and the Apostle's was the same, which was to show that when God exercised His omnipotence, it was to "work all things after the counsel of His own will."

However, as he may have applied the term inadvertently, I am willing to let that matter pass. When he does not use a proof or demonstration in the presentation of his spiritual doctrines he can hardly expect other people to be convinced, and when his mind is not open to the conviction arising from a proof or demonstration, he cannot expect to be convinced himself. How, then, will he advance in the acquisition of truth? How will he "hold fast that which is good," unless he first *prove all things*? How will he advance "in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him"?

R. DONALDSON.

Finton, October 30th, 1889.

CHRISTIAN GRATITUDE.

SIR,—It is very pardonable for a clergyman to forget his old sermons, but less so perhaps when the

preaching, the publishing, and the forgetting are all comprised within a short month. Yet this is what Mr. Sandlands seems to me to have done, when in his appeal against my stricture on his sermon he represents its doctrine as being "that we most show our gratitude to God by seeking further blessings at His hands," and illustrates what he means by this statement in the words which immediately follow: "I do feel that I cannot offer any adequate return for His many blessings beyond that of a heart ready for more." Now, neither of these sentences represents the teaching against which I ventured to remonstrate. In the sermon there is no softening down of the "asking for more" into "offering a heart ready for more," which is a very different thing; neither does the sermon admit any other method of gratitude at all. It argues that no other way is possible, and that we "are shut up to" this method, which, again, is very different from saying that "we *most* show our gratitude" in this way.

I must repeat that what Mr. Sandlands distinctly affirmed, and I objected to, is the proposition that the true and only way of showing gratitude to God for mercies received is the asking for more mercies. He now challenges me to do two things: to point out any other way, and to show that the texts quoted by him do not teach this way. In replying, I will be as brief as possible.

First, the Psalmist himself, on whom Mr. Sandlands relies for his doctrine, refutes it by immediately announcing another method which his gratitude will adopt: "I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people." St. Paul, in a formal and typical statement, teaches another method: "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice. . . and be not conformed to this world." On this passage our Church bases her solemn Eucharistic strain of self-dedication in return for the Divine mercies: "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee"; while in her daily thanksgiving she instructs us that our gratitude is to be shown by giving up ourselves to God's service, and by walking before Him in holiness and righteousness all our days. Here, then, a clear and practical mode of showing gratitude is inculcated, and it is not that of asking for more.

Secondly, Mr. Sandlands quotes four texts: let us look at them. (1) "To him that hath, more shall be given." A law, doubtless, of the kingdom of grace; but not a word about gratitude or the way of showing it. (2) "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name, I will do it." A gracious promise to Christian prayer, but nothing else. (3) "Ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." A wonderful encouragement to pray, but still not a word about gratitude. (4) "Be careful for nothing, but in everything by prayers and supplications with thanksgiving, let your request be made known unto God." This is a receipt against anxiety. Tell all your wants to God, accompanying your requests with thanksgiving, and His peace shall guard your hearts. Here, again, not a word about asking for more being the true expression of gratitude; the thanksgiving and the petition are distinguished from each other. Ask freely, but don't forget to be thankful.

I have nothing to say against the doctrine that experience of answers to our prayers is a great encouragement to pray, for it strengthens the faith in

God our Father by which true prayer is animated. Neither do I question that gratitude, for past mercies ought to be present to the mind from which prayer for more proceeds. The ungrateful man cannot pray rightly. Nor do I doubt that real gratitude fits the heart to become a worthy recipient and steward of additional blessings. I am sure that unselfish prayer honours God, because it exhibits filial trust in His goodness; and to honour God in any way must always be pleasant to the grateful heart. What I protest against, as equally irrational and unscriptural, is the definite statement that asking for more blessings is the only real way of showing gratitude to God for mercies already received.

PRESBYTER.

P.S. — I notice that Mr. Murphy, whose contributions I always read with interest, adds a fifth text to Mr. Sandlands' four, but it appears to me to have the same fault of entire irrelevancy, since about gratitude and the method of showing that beautiful disposition, it says nothing whatever. Is it possible to find any light on the point in dispute in the words, "Of His fulness we all received, and grace for grace"? How can a declaration of Christ's relation of grace to us be transmuted into a declaration of the mode in which our gratitude for it is to be shown? I very much doubt if Mr. Murphy's interpretation of the famous expression "grace for grace" can stand. New grace, superseding and occupying the place of old grace, is the literal meaning; there is no authority in the original for adding that the new grace is given simply for its own sake, independently of our good use of the preceding grace. Certainly the general doctrine of Scripture is that to him who uses grace rightly more grace is given. To this effect is Dr. Westcott's comment on the passage, and probably there is no weightier authority than his on St. John's Gospel: "Each blessing appropriated became the foundation of a greater blessing. To have realised and used one measure of grace was to have gained a larger measure (as it were) in exchange for it."

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ash, Rev. R. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Spalding; Chaplain of Spalding Workhouse.
 Beaumont, Rev. William Beresford, M.A., Rector of Coleorton; Honorary Canon in Peterborough Cathedral.
 Betham, Rev. C. J., M.A., Rector of Brettenham and Honorary Canon of Ely; Rural Dean of Lavenham.

Burrows, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A.; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the south-eastern district of the Diocese of Manchester.
 Clark, Rev. C. H., Vicar of St. Mary's, Hayling Island.
 Dahl, Rev. W. E., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Frome; Vicar of East Pennard, Somersetshire.
 Davidson, Rev. Archibald Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Scorton; Diocesan Inspector for the north-western district of the Diocese of Manchester.
 Dyson, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of Oare, Kent.
 Footitt, Rev. C. E. W., B.A., Vicar of Threkingham; Rector of Burton Pedwardine, Sleaford.
 Gray, Rev. E. A., Assistant-Curate of Wimbledon; Rector of Lydgate, Newmarket.
 Gregson, Rev. William, Curate; Vicar of Flore, near Weedon.
 Hervey, Rev. James Arthur, B.A., Vicar of Alfreton, Derbyshire.
 Hill, Rev. Rowland, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Dorchester, and Hon. Chaplain to the Marquis of Lothian, K.T.; Acting Chaplain to the Troops at Dorchester.
 King, Rev. Edward George, D.D., Vicar of Madingley, Cambridge; Rector of Gayton, near Blisworth.
 Law, Rev. J. H. A., M.A., Assistant-Curate of Kewstoke-with-Milton; Vicar of Babraham, Cambridge.
 Letchworth, Rev. Henry Howard, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Maidstone.
 Marlow, Rev. Edward, B.A., Vicar of Swadlincote, Derbyshire.
 May, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Senior Curate of Leeds Parish Church; Rector of St. Peter's, Heswall, Chester.
 Moberly, Rev. George Herbert, Vicar of Monkton Farley; Prebendary of Alton Borealis, in Sarum Cathedral.
 Pelly, Rev. Frederick William, B.A., Vicar of Bulmer-cum-Belchamp Walter, Essex.
 Peregrine, Rev. David Wilkie, B.A., Rector of Kelvedon, Essex.
 Petty, Rev. H. M., B.A., Missions to Seamen Chaplain Falmouth Roads.
 Piper, Rev. Arthur Dalzell, B.A., Vicar of Albury, Herts.
 Ravenhill, Rev. Henry Everett, Vicar of Buckland Newton-with-Plush; Prebendary of Hurstborne and Burbage, in Sarum Cathedral.
 Raymond, Rev. Oliver Edward, M.A., Rector of Middleton, Essex.
 Rivers, Rev. Henry Frederick, M.A., Vicar of St. Faith's, Maidstone.
 Rolfe, Rev. C. J., Curate-in-Charge of St. Thomas's, Stockton-heath, Warrington.
 Russell, Rev. Edward Bachelor, Vicar of Appledore, Kent.
 St. John-Mildmay, Rev. G. A., Rector of St. Mary's, Stamford.
 Stansfield, Rev. J. B. E., M.A., Rector of Preston, Uppingham, Rutlandshire; Rector of Downham, Essex.
 Stapleton, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Bradford.
 Stokes, Rev. C. A., M.A., Vicar of Warmfield; Rector of Great Waldingfield, Suffolk.
 Taylor, Rev. John William, M.A., Rector of Stathern, and late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge; Rural Dean of Framland (First Deanery).
 Theobald, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of Lasham; Rural Dean of Alton.
 Trotman, Rev. E. F., B.C.L., Vicar of Marshfield; Honorary Canon in Bristol Cathedral.
 Tutti, Rev. L. R., Chaplain of Stuttgart; Rector of Westley Waterless, Newmarket.
 Valentine, Rev. Henry Tristram, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's Walden, Herts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barnes, Rev. Richard Nelson, for forty years Vicar of Kingsclere, at Kingsclere Vicarage, Hants, on the 4th inst., aged 81.
 Bowmar, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Mears Ashby, Northampton, on the 29th ult.
 Coalbank, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Old Dalby, near Melton Mowbray, on the 29th of September, aged 83.
 Crosse, Rev. Ernest Willson, Curate of St. Mary's, Portsea, at 30, Norfolk-crescent, W., on the 4th inst., aged 25.
 Hemsworth, Rev. Augustus Barker, at Bacton Rectory, on the 23rd ult.
 Nevill, Rev. Frank, M.A., Principal of the Church Missionary College, Freetown, at Sierra Leone, on the 2nd inst.
 Shepherd, Rev. R., late Rector of St. Paul's, Heaton Moor, at Silloth, Cumberland, on the 30th ult., aged 48.
 Watkins, Rev. Henry George, M.A., at the Vicarage, Potter's Bar, on the 3rd inst., aged 81.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THREE DANGERS IN CHURCH CONGRESSES.

BY THE BISHOP OF DERRY.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE CHURCH CONGRESS AT CARDIFF, ON OCTOBER 4TH, 1889.

"They continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."—ACTS ii. 42.

"All these things happened unto them for ensamples."—1 COR. x. 11.

"All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will."—1 COR. xii. 11.

ON these occasions of our Church Congresses—may I dare to say first a little too frequent?—many earnest brethren of our clergy and laity meet together for counsel and help in the teeming Christian life of the Anglican Church in the nineteenth century, a life teeming alike in speculation and action. No one who looks at the list of subjects for this year or last can well charge those who are responsible with timidity or traditionalism. In this respect a change has come alike over our clergy and laity. For the clergy, compare the present generation with those of the last century, and of the first quarter of this. We may remember the picture, drawn with Addison's softest pencil, of Sir Roger de Coverley's chaplain, or the description, laughingly, but not unlovingly, given by the witty Canon of St. Paul's, of the country parson as one who by constantly living in one place became a sort of "sacred vegetable." The clergy, for good more than evil, are among the most locomotive, the most loquacious, the most speculative, the most experimental of English citizens. The laity who care for these subjects at all care for them very much. They are as far as possible from wishing to hear South, Barrow, Taylor, Tillotson every Sunday. They demand, if not *nova*, at least, *novè dicta*. A Church Congress must naturally reproduce these characteristics of the earnest clergy and laity of every branch of our communion.

And of this feature of our Church Congresses we need not be much afraid. The solid metal which has stood the proof charge of such tests as the Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic movements is not likely to burst with the loose powder of a Church Congress, though it may blaze and make a noise.

Yet, after all, now as ever—now, perhaps, more than ever—there are three forms of danger, against which we should be on our guard. In progress of

time, in presence of keenly felt want, something is plausibly proposed which is alien from, and inconsistent with, the Church's structural principles; some imperfect view is asserted of the Church's life; some narrow conception is formed of the Church's gifts.

On these three points I propose to speak this morning, starting in each case from one of the three passages of Scripture which I have read.

I. In our first text we have the original structural principles of the Church as the home of the baptised. They are four:—1. "The doctrine of the Apostles." The word rendered doctrine is unhappily exchanged for "teaching." No doubt it sometimes signifies act of teaching or mode of teaching. But here and elsewhere it can mean nothing but the body and soul of faithful doctrine. By this all doctrine must be tested—"by the doctrine of the Apostles." Advance in science is by progress; in theology by regress. In science the first propositions are true so far as they agree with the last developments; in theology the last developments are true so far as they agree with the first propositions. 2. "The fellowship"—i.e., the jointness, the community of life, of feeling, of method—the union in things sacred and ecclesiastical; the freedom from that *incuria* which so ill beseems those who have been made citizens of the city of God. 3. "The breaking of the bread;" the constant participation in the central act of Christian worship. 4. "The prayers," joint, constant, public; and, as regards these two last, let it be noted that the fixity of the Church is not the fixity of a dead stake driven into the ground; it is the fixity of a tree with all the splendid play of its exultant life. Thus, as to "the bread," all act and symbolism in worship is the surrounding of the sacramental idea; the embodiment outwardly and materially of that which is spiritual; the effervescence from the great sacramental stem, filling the Church with perfume and loveliness.

Let us not fail to observe the conciliation, the equipoise, the free and spontaneous self-adjustment of elements too often separated by modern religionism. The great Christian thinker and preacher of Protestant Lausanne, as he compared the splendour and enthusiasm of the Roman Benediction with the slim and meagre rite of Genevan Calvinism, exclaimed in melancholy tones, "Rome has worship without the word, we have the word without worship." But the earliest Church, as delineated by its great historian, combines all these elements, and appeals to man through all his faculties. It appeals to his intellect by its doctrine. It wakens his social feelings—whether towards contemporary Christians, or spirits waiting in the world unseen, or great predecessors in the faith; nay, something higher still—"And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." It deals with the soul in its most mysterious depths by the consciousness of a Pres-

ence at once awful and blessed. It has treasures, and it opens for every one of its children a language of sobs and rapture, of penitence and joy—a wealth of words that set themselves to some far-off music, which linger along fretted roofs, yet nestle in our hearts, and in our last hours sing us into the sleep of death as if with the lullaby of God. Thus, as in the description of her first structure, the Church is doctrinal, emotional, sacramental, liturgical. She is a school of teaching, a centre of social unity, a shrine of sacraments, a home of worship. The child of heaven, destined to an inheritance so splendid, was strong and radiant in her cradle. All the possibilities of her history and her being lay folded in her heart from the very first.

So far of the essential principles of the Church's structure.

II. We may now pass on to that comprehensive view of the Church's life which is given to us in the opening section of the 9th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Looking at it generally, we may say that it presents the Church's life to us under a two-fold aspect. It is guided by a Divine Book; it is initiated and sustained by Divine ordinances. In other words, it is Biblical and sacramental.

1. The life of the Church is guided by a Divine Book. It is Biblical.

Let us look at St. Paul's way of using one important portion of Old Testament history.

A revelation to a being like man comes with peculiar propriety and force in the guise of a human history. If there were no sacred history, one of the most effective *media* for the transmission of revealed light would be wanting. As it is, much of this historical revelation is divinely interpreted. And thus the acts of men become a transparency through which we see the finger of God.

The mode at present in vogue of reading the Old Testament is entirely critical and literal. So, indeed, is the study of the New Testament. Picturesqueness is the modern substitute for spirituality. For instance, Galilee is a lake, and a beautiful one. And a large lake contains fish. The modern expositor paints the storm light and the sunlight upon the waters as beautifully as he can; he enumerates the kind of fish. This is very well in its way. But the Evangelists aim at something higher. They forget ichthyology in theology. The light to which they point the eyes of men is not of morning or evening, of star or storm, but of "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The old Puritan waxed fierce against "word-warrers," who made the leaves of Scripture like those of the logicians. What of the word-painters under whose art the pages of Moses or of St. John are no more spiritual than those of Macaulay?

Now this mode of reading Scripture—exclusively critical and picturesque—was not that of primitive Christianity. Consider that portion of sacred his-

tory with which St. Paul is dealing. How shall we read it?—A true history, and so far to be read by aids of the same kind as other; but never a Divine history. A Christian reader, in studying it, should be like one walking down a gallery with strangely woven tapestries, wherein are hints and outlined indications of his own course. "Pharaoh stands for Satan, the Red Sea for baptism, the Rock is Jesus, the manna is the Bread of God, the water is the Cup of Salvation." So a score of fathers in many a glowing page; so the simple painters of the catacombs in their rude but expressive colours.

A modern student looks up from his copy of the geological survey of the Sinaitic peninsula, and smiles or sighs. What, St. Paul? Just before our present passage he had been speaking of something pre-eminently Greek. But the tent-maker of Tarsus, the pupil of Rabbi Gamaliel, had not the true Hellenic instinct. He turns to something pre-eminently Hebrew. He hurriedly passes from the stadium, from the boxer, from the training, from the herald, from the crown—from the shapes of grace and strength, so delicate in symmetry, so unrivalled in power, lovely and majestic in the Grecian sunlight. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea." What an eternal significance there is for St. Paul in the Old Testament! How different the polished and artistic Corinth and its inhabitants from the rude wanderers in the desert! Yet the old story lingers on unexhausted. These things happened for them "typically;" for us "with a view to our admonition."

Here I necessarily pause. How much more is there for the Christian in the Old Testament. Not merely the growth of eternal life, the Messianic preparation, the Christ in psalm and prophecy. The superior and cynical young man smiles at the simple Hebraism of his elders, as the Jew, cradled in Hebrew and breathing it from his nursery, smiles at him. The superior young man is of the school of Ewald. One Edward Bouverie Pusey was not simply of the school of Ewald, but his personal pupil. He will listen to you, when you have learnt as patiently and thought as much.

But if the life of the Church is thus Biblical; if it has its roots in the Old Testament, how much more in the New? We can but consider this in one department of the New Testament—that which contains what the Church emphatically speaks of as St. Paul's "holy doctrine."

What is that? How is the Church's life necessarily involved in it?

The doctrine called Pauline is not always a holy one—sometimes it is contaminated with antinomianism: the sectarian forgets the great short antithesis, "being not without law to God, but under law to Christ." Sometimes that which calls itself Pauline theology is an atrabilious, ferocious system which drives and damns; which narrows the arms

of Jesus, until one is tempted to cry, "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His thoughts higher than your thoughts." This doctrine is a holy doctrine, for two great reasons—(a) it teaches justification by faith, sanctification by grace. Do you say, "I fail to see the connection?" Let me ask you whether, when this is forgotten, the Church's mutilated Gospel does not produce a mutilated character and mutilated work? Survey first what may be called compendiously liberal Christianity. It has a superficial idea of sin and of holiness. It produces but a half seriousness, a sort of worldliness tempered by theological speculation—or rather by critical study. It is thin and arid, clear and shallow. From its macadamised roads are none but commonplace views. The Gospel is a respectable literature. Its preachers deliver sensible leading articles. It has no martyrs, no missionaries, no pastors, no saints, no sacred depths, no lurking tears, no groanings that cannot be uttered. In all its churches there is no altar, in all its churches no cross. Now from this turn to the opposite extreme, to the great Roman Catholic communion. That system has the idea of sin, of holiness, of redemption. But it receives the wonderful Augustinian summary of St. Paul—"not grace from works, but works with grace"—with "public applause, but with secret reluctance" (one of Gibbon's few profound theological remarks). Where that Church prevails the Pauline doctrine is generally unknown. Therefore, in Roman Catholic countries, society may too clearly be divided into the frivolous and the fanatic—the frivolous many, for whom life has too much sunshine; the earnest few, for whom religion has too little, because they forget that "being justified by faith we have peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord." (b) Yet again St. Paul's is a "holy doctrine," because it teaches us present living union with a present Church. There are three prepositions which characteristically and vitally are favourites with the chiefest among the Apostles—of St. Peter, with his ardent character, ever stretching out from himself "unto" the future, *εἰς* is the favourite; with St. Paul, for whom all things are in harmony with a Divine law, after a great and gracious will, *κατά* is the preposition that recurs again and again; with St. John *ἐν* is the favourite; the mystical, spiritual abiding in Christ—the still, strong, sweet changelessness of a rooted life—the parable of the vine in two little letters. But with St. Paul also *ἐν* is a favourite in almost the same degree—"a man in Christ," immanence in Him, following Him, in St. Paul's "holy doctrine," unapproachably brought out by the order of the Christian year from Christmas to Ascension Day.

2. But if the life of the Church is guided by a Divine Book, it is also initiated and sustained by Divine ordinances. If it is Biblical it is also sacramental. St. Paul tells us the sweet and solemn story—"All our fathers were under the cloud, all

passed through the sea; were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink." They drank, looked upon as one act; they were drinking from time to time. For the rock in Rephidim and the cliff in Kadesh (of which we specially read in the 17th of Exodus and the 20th of Numbers) only renewed the first and last gifts of the kind. Many another rock and cliff in that mysterious land, burning like a furnace in the blaze of day, was touched by a wondrous Presence. "He brought streams also out of the rocks, and caused waters to run like rivers: He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink as out of the great depths." St. Paul calls to his aid no vulgarising touch of Rabbinical legend; he amuses with no facile miracle of a perforated rock, that rolled along as they marched, like a beehive or barrel. The water and the bread were "spiritual," because given by the spiritual Presence of the spiritual Rock ever following with them, and that Rock was Christ. "*Qualis petra, talis aqua.*" The whole passage is sacramental to its very depths. The words in which it finally culminates speak of two sacraments, and two only—"By one Spirit were we all baptised into one body; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."

Thus the Church's life is a sacramental life.

Now, beyond doubt this idea excites misgiving in not a few religious minds. It is rejected even passionately by men of singular devoutness. Let me refer to one cause out of many for this feeling among the masses of our people. It is the fatal prerogative of genius to fascinate and mislead. Genius liquefies the mind on which it acts by the intensity of passion which it applies, and stamps upon it an enduring conception which, when it once hardens, can scarcely be changed without the application of a similar heat and the action of a different stamp. Theology is no exception to the rule. How many of our obstinate mistakes about the Fall and Redemption may be traced to Milton! So the matter of the spiritual life. For Englishmen there is an irresistible charm in Bunyan's allegory, in his land of Beulah and Delectable Mountains. In his allegory there are, I believe, only two dim and distant references to the Holy Communion.

It has been, I think very strangely, said that "if this be so as regards Bunyan, the charge is equally applicable to the New Testament—at least in the Epistles." What of the passage before us? It is as if St. Paul read the Pentateuch by the light of the baptistery and of the east window. Under these two aspects he sees the life of the Church, in the desert and the life of the Church in the world. In the wondrous texture woven by the hand of the tentmaker there are two silver threads, one baptismal, the other Eucharistic. The "Pilgrim's Progress" of St. Paul corrects the "Pilgrim's Progress" of Bunyan.

It may be said to the preacher, "What lesson do you propose to draw for a gathering like the Congress from such an exposition?" I will reply frankly. There is a peculiar freedom in Congresses. There is a little rash talk and wild theory, as well as much wisdom and eloquence. Strange experiments are proposed by those who have scarcely measured the depth from which truth springs. Devout ears may be scandalised by the apotheosis of Mahommed, or by the deposition of the Evangelists. Eloquent advocacy may win a hearing for very questionable speculations. Now, it may have a sobering effect to have the great lines of the Church's construction and life drawn out before us in the very beginning of our debates; and we may resolve to approve and admit nothing which is inconsistent therewith.

Above all, let us go away with the assured conviction that in our own system fairly carried out there is an unrivalled union of the Bible element and the sacramental element—the Bible lighting the mystery, the mystery tenderly shadowing the Bible.

On the first point English Christians, on the whole, are happily agreed. The Bible is placed in the soldier's knapsack, in the sailor's chest, in the emigrant's trunk; among the bride's presents, inside the coffin. The greatest and best efforts of English scholarship have been devoted to the defence and elucidation of the New Testament; the Old Testament still calls for its Lightfoots and Westcotts, for another Pusey. Of all that can be said about that Book, it is more than worthy. Its beauty is like that of the Lake of Bourget, among the hills of Savoy. The traveller seems to see a blue stripe of the Mediterranean which has become displaced, lying in storm or sunshine in its mountain-cup. What is the secret of that ærial colour, that intensity of azure, too deep for turquoise, too tender for sapphire? It is no colouring matter in solution. It is the lustrous self-expression; it is the lovely self-investiture of depth, of transparency, of purity. Such is the beauty of the Bible, the beauty of the depth and transparency of its thoughts. Other books pass away; but of that the silver cord shall never be loosed, nor the golden bowl broken, nor the mourners that go about the streets proclaim that at last the great Book is dead, and carried to the charnel-house of dead religions. Let us read it still as St. Paul did. Let us show to those outside that nowhere is it so entirely read in the ears of the people, nowhere so fully trusted, nowhere so deeply studied by the clergy. And withal let nothing make us ashamed to profess that, while we honour our separated brethren, and own their work for God, this is what we are set to do and witness—that alone among us, in Reformed communions, are children taught that in baptism they are made children of God; that alone among us in confirmation, together with the grace of strength, young Christians are singly and specially

brought into connection with the gifts of the Spirit; that alone among us it is proclaimed that the Body of Christ is "given, taken, eaten"—only after "a heavenly and spiritual manner"—while faith reveres a Presence which she does not make, but perceives.

III. It remains to speak of the gifts of the Church, of which St. Paul, even while preparing to correct and chasten any over-estimate, expresses such breathless admiration; as with kindling eye and quivering voice he contemplates their noble variety, in the beginning of the 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians.

It seems to me that these gifts are capable of division into three classes, and of being translated into modern language. (1) Intellect: to one, the word of wisdom, to another of the same class (*ἄλλω*) the word of knowledge—*i.e.*, the theologian's complete grasp of the revealed truth, the more acute perhaps, but less comprehensive application of religion in its practical details. (2) In a different class (*ἐτέρω*), in another department, that of faith. To one, faith in its intensity for personal salvation; to another in the same class (*ἄλλω*) grace gifts connected with healing and comfort even for the bodies of men; to another, some development of the capabilities inherent in his new life; to another, some of the ever-great developments of the life given by the Spirit, some fore-speaking or forth-speaking, some standing in the foreground and speaking out from and of the dawn; to another, the true critical tests by which principles are tried, so necessary in a world where good and evil are intermingled, and the serpent hisses in the same brake where the wild bird sings. (3) Yet a third and different class (*ἐτέρω*), which brings us in contact with other and rarer gifts, "kinds of tongues." Shall we say that this has passed away? Nay, in a living Church are there no "gifts of healings"? Is there no such thing as educated tenderness, as strength and beauty bowing down for Christ's sake before decrepitude and decay? "To one of a different class (*ἐτέρω*) kinds of tongues, to another of the same class (*ἄλλω*) interpretation of tongues." So long as Christianity has varied expositions in the language of art, of poetry, of music, of philosophy; so long as there is excellent exposition of the darkest and deepest utterances of inspired men and heaven-taught thinkers; so long the Church will not want a real glossary. To these gifts the Church has never entirely surrendered her claim. To all who will receive it confirmation is offered by the chief pastors of the Church. The earliest confirmations were accompanied by gifts as well as graces. For these we still pray—"Daily increase in them Thy manifold gifts of grace." Strip some strong arm—look at the knotted muscles. Are the varied energies of which the arm is capable the work of the muscles? The muscles are but the *media* of a

real but unseen influence. The nerves unlock and stiffen the muscles; and behind them is the will, without which the muscles would be but a lump of gristle. So with the Church's arm—all these workings are the result of muscles and nerves of the human organisation in the inworking, the energy of a Living Will, of an Almighty Personal Force. "All these inworketh the one and the same Spirit, distinguishing to each severally as He willeth."

IV.—There is one application of that which has been said which may come naturally from an Irish Bishop.

What of disestablishment?

Politically little can come from one who stands in this place. It may, however, be remarked that you in Wales will probably meet with counsellors of two opposite classes. One of these are political fatalists. They hold that in democratic England the party of attack is necessarily stronger than the party of defence, who have nothing to do but yield on the best terms which they can procure. Another class inculcates a manlier lesson. They discover elements of hope that you are much stronger than we were in 1867-9. The Church in Wales has more rational prospect of becoming national in the popular sense than the Irish Church. The language of the leader of the attack is measured and doubtful. These friends urge Welsh Churchmen to be up and doing—to enlist every voter—to press forward every argument, remembering that they are custodians of a great deposit for ages unborn. And we, of the Irish Church, bid you God speed, not only for your own sake, but for that of England, and of the world.

But if that which you wish not comes to pass: if death comes at last to her who is "killed all the day long," do not despair. Deign, some of you, to cross the sixty miles of stormy water between the Principality and Ireland. Forget some of our rash words, and inspect some of our wise works in finance and organisation. No doubt we are in peril. The hill up which our little host must march is steep and the hail beats in our faces. We hear the steady tramp of the serried ranks of Rome round us; the shout of the marauders of Plymouth rises, as they, ever and anon, cut off a few stragglers. We draw close, and grip our muskets closer. Above us is the strong City, crowned with light, and the sweet rest, where the old soldier may lie down with his white head pressed upon the pillow, until the morning wakens him with the storm of triumph sweeping along the streets. Churchmen of Wales, fall back on something above Parliaments and establishments. "Her foundations are upon the holy hills. Very excellent things are spoken of thee, thou city of God." On your high hills and lovely valleys full often the Church's children are but a little flock. Yet fear not, for even so weak a voice sounds in your ears these three great thoughts. The Church's unchanging structure in heart, in association, in Eucharist,

in Liturgy. The Church's undying life in creed and sacrament. The Church's gifts. "A shower of greennesses wilt thou shake out," as the inspired poet sings, seeing Christ's robe moving like a cloud along the hills, shaking out showers, of which each drop is a baptism of benediction. And, O brethren of the clergy, "Covet earnestly the best gifts. Yet show I unto you a more excellent way," the way taught (as St. Bernard says) "not by learning, but by unction; not by science, but by conscience." (*"Non scientiâ sed conscientiâ."*) The Apostle's great heart is on fire, and borne on to his psalm of love. Feel and speak with him who said, "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you, that the more abundantly I love you the less I be loved." All true love possesses a microscope and a key. The microscope brings out with a Divine delicacy the great lines of duty. The key opens the stiffest heart by its magic touch. Without these gifts are vain.

HARVEST FESTIVAL.

BY THE REV. J. MASKELL, MASTER AND CHAPLAIN OF EMANUEL HOSPITAL, WESTMINSTER.

NOTES AND OUTLINES OF A CHILDREN'S SERMON PREACHED AT ST. JAMES-THE-LESS, WESTMINSTER, OCTOBER 13TH, 1889.

OUR church wears a different aspect to-day from what it does on ordinary Sundays, because this is our thanksgiving for the harvest.

We ought to thank God every day, since we pray for daily bread; but there are times of special thanksgiving; of special meditation, on the great goodness of God.

Why have these decorations been added to the church this day, but because they are tokens of gratitude—a part of our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. [Explain the meaning of a sacrifice; show that it should cost something—money, time, labour, etc.] God does not want these things, but He is pleased when we offer them in His house, just as a good parent delights in some little present which a child may make, however small in value.

But it would be a great mistake to allow our harvest thanksgiving to end only in decoration of the church, or more music, etc. No sacrifice is accepted unless we give ourselves. [Illustrate this by Cain's offering. *By faith* Abel offered a better sacrifice. Cain had no reality, no love, no faith in his heart.] How do you thank father and mother for all their goodness? Not by merely saying "Thank you," but by trying to please them; by being affectionate, dutiful, and obedient. So we must thank God by obeying His will. The

first lesson is this: *The best way to thank God is to try always to be good.*

Yet it is well to thank Him with the lips, to show forth His praises, study His works, and realise His wisdom, power, and goodness as we seek to do this day. There are few things in nature more wonderful as showing God's power than the annual growth of corn and fruit resulting in the harvest. We speak of miracles and wonder at the miracles of Scripture [refer to the Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes] but the annual growth of corn is equally miraculous, only taking a longer time to perform. [Describe the gradual growth of a grain of wheat from seed to leaf and from leaf to ear, etc., etc.] God is not tied to time. The swift passage of a current of electricity shows this. He still shows that He can work "wonders and signs," if necessary, in a moment of time. Our second lesson, then, is: *The growth of corn and other things is a yearly miracle.*

The harvest witnesses to the variety and usefulness of God's works and His vast treasures of beauty. Look round the church; call attention to the variety of flowers, fruits, and ears of corn. Refer to the green of the fields, the different colours and shapes of trees, etc. They prove that God is love, for He delights in beautiful things and wishes to make us happy, to give us pleasure and joy. Then refer to the constant pleasant and sweet taste of bread, of which we are never tired, and to such a common fruit as the apple, which no animal ever seems to refuse. We may get tired of many foods, but never of bread and other common things so necessary for health, and which God has made so sweet for our sakes. So (3) *The beauty of the world and the sweetness of our daily bread help to show that God is love.*

One way of showing gratitude is never wilfully to waste anything which is God-given. The waste of food is a sin; we ought to make the best use of everything. Economy. A serious thing is the way in which so much good corn is wasted by being made into strong drink. Thence come the wasted lives of the drunkard and the ruin of so many. We ought to take care of our health for God's sake, and remember that our bodies are too sacred to be wasted on sin and Satan. So (4) *One way of showing gratitude is never wilfully to waste anything.*

I might say now something about the harvest of character which each is sowing—how little actions, good and bad, like little seeds, sow habits in the soul, and form consequences which are like good and bad harvests. We should be reminded that God has given us greater gifts than food and clothing; the understanding mind, and the capacity to rejoice in His works. This reminds us how terrible a thing it is to neglect the growth of character. But this is too long a subject to be treated now.

[Let all the children now repeat the four lessons given in italics.]

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C.B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW**, in a simple, effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quick prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary. **OBESITY IS CURED**, besent, gratis and post free, on application to the Medical Battery Company, Limited.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1889.

FREE EDUCATION.

THERE is an old proverb which says that "straws show which way the wind blows," and some may take it that the proverbial straws do at the present time show what is uppermost in the minds of Churchmen. During the last few weeks we have been deluged with accounts of the Church Congress, and of the various Diocesan Conferences, in all of which the subject of education has been freely discussed. In some cases it has been the new Code which the Government have shadowed forth; in others the best way of keeping up the Voluntary Schools; and in one or two the question of Free Education has been discussed.

For many years past Mr. Chamberlain and a certain section of the Radical Party have boldly advocated Free Education. Those who live in densely-populated districts know the difficulty that there is in making people pay the school fees of their children, and this difficulty is intensified by the fact that education is now compulsory, and that if the children are not seen in the schools, the attendance officer promptly pays a visit to the homes, and inquires the cause of absence, with the threat that unless there is regular attendance "proceedings" will be taken. How to force this payment of fees is a difficult matter. In cases of destitution the Board of Guardians have the power to pay the fees out of the rates, but many will go through a good deal rather than face the ordeal of a cross-questioning examination in the Board-room of a workhouse. While, however, Free Education will solve one difficulty, it will only give rise to further difficulties. It is well known that the land has quite as much burden laid upon it in the way

of rates and taxes as it can well bear; nay, rather may it be said that the burden of rates and taxes is too heavy to be borne, in the face of the agricultural depression. And even in large towns the desire for improvements in the way of finer streets and larger municipal buildings has within the last few years put a grievous burden upon the denizens of our large towns and cities, which even the present improvement in trade hardly mitigates. It is evident, therefore, that the land, and the rates and taxes, can hardly bear the strain of providing Free Education. Further, when we examine a little closer the antecedents of these apostles of Free Education, we find that they have all of them been, and doubtless are at the present moment (although it may not be politic to advertise the fact), supporters of the Disestablishment and Disendowment movement; and, therefore, if we are to have Free Education in this country, it will be at the expense of something else, and that "something else" we opine will be the revenues of the Established Church, after the life-interest of the present occupiers of ecclesiastical offices are provided for. It would be well, then, for any advocate of Free Education, before he pledges himself to this new propaganda, to ask the question, and also to get a definite answer, as to the ways and means where-with this measure is to be carried out.

Experience has taught us that while education is a great boon, School Boards have been expensive luxuries, and if we are to have Free Education we shall find that the cost will be very great indeed. And it is a question whether (bearing in mind the great expense that the nation has been put to since the passing of the Education Act of 1870) the results have been in proportion to the cost incurred. We have seen magnificent schools built, with every latest improvement; palatial offices, erected for the members of the Board to meet in to conduct their business; an immense array of officials, clerks, surveyors, and attendance officers, etc.; while the pay of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses has proportionately increased. And, therefore, if we may judge by the past, whenever the scheme of Free Education is launched we shall find further expense, for which a new source of revenue will be required; and people may well consider, Is this further extension commensurate with the cost which must of necessity be entailed? But to Churchmen the most important question of the present day is, How best to secure full religious teaching for the young in our Elementary Schools? From the Board Schools religion has been almost, if not altogether, excluded, and therefore it is most important that this question should not be lost sight of, or be put in the background. Many of the advocates for School Boards are the very people who have done the least for education; while, on the other hand, Churchmen have done more for the education of the young than all other bodies put together. Long before the Act of 1870 was

passed the Church had her National Parochial Schools; and even now, amid the terrible competition which exists, the clergy still hold manfully to their schools, struggling on, although harassed with pecuniary difficulties as to ways and means, to keep these nurseries for the instruction of children not only in rudiments of education, such as shall satisfy the requirements of the department, but also to ensure thorough religious teaching, without which the other may well be compared to a building without a foundation and a top-stone. Surely Voluntary Schools require more sympathy and support than they get at present. The question as to whether any aid shall be given to these schools from the rates is a very difficult and complex one, and we wait for some definite statement upon the subject.

All things seem to point to the fact that we are on the eve of a great crisis in educational matters, and what the result will be time alone can tell. If all Churchmen were resolved to follow as far as possible the noble action of the Bishop of Salisbury, then we should have no fear for the success of the Voluntary Schools. We trust that Churchmen will keep their heads cool—forewarned, and therefore forearmed—and boldly stand out for clear, decided religious education as one great factor in the education of the future.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE SERMON BIBLE." Vol. IV. Isaiah to Malachi. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

WE have very little to add to our words of commendation spoken of the three preceding volumes, except that the new volume is quite equal to those which went before.

We quite agree with the editor in his opinion of the value of Dr. Alexander's little book on Zechariah; it is but a little book, but there is much matter in it.

On "Moab hath been at ease from his youth" (Jer. xlviii. 11), the editor does not refer to Christopher's sermon; we think he might have done so with advantage.

We feel little doubt that those who have the preceding volumes will purchase this too; and they will not be disappointed.

"IMAGO CHRISTI: THE EXAMPLE OF JESUS CHRIST." By the Rev. James Stalker, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

MR. STALKER'S introductory chapter on Thomas à Kempis' "Imitation of Christ" indicates at once the purpose of his book, and, we might add, contains the germ both of its excellencies and deficiencies. Not that he is in any way unfair to the immortal "Imitation." He very justly says that the "only other book which may possibly compete with it in popularity is the 'Pilgrim's Progress,'" and adds that "the hold on Christendom of the older work is probably more extensive." But between the two he draws no comparison, nor is any possible. They were the outcome

of ages with wholly different ideals—the contemplative, the practical. The age that produced the “Imitation” seemed to conceive of no higher type of a Christian than a perfect monk; the age that produced that pilgrim by whose side every one of us has journeyed, treated a monastic shrine with as little reverence as Hezekiah treated the brazen serpent. Both had, and have, Scriptural precedents. Did not Mary who sat at the feet of Jesus gain a praise not awarded to her practical-minded sister? And yet the award to those on the right hand is for very practical virtues. Which are we to choose? Thomas à Kempis said Mary’s choice; Bunyan and Mr. Stalker, and indeed almost all nowadays, lay great stress on feeding the hungry, visiting the prisoners, clothing the naked—very practical virtues, we admit. Is not the solution something like this: It is a point of order—the “Imitation,” the sitting at the feet of Jesus, first; then, but not till then, the practical virtues which Mr. Stalker sees in Jesus of Nazareth, and so well draws lessons from. Dr. Edersheim in his “Life”—far and far the best “Life” ever written—notes well that Christ closes, not commences, His three chief ministries with a “supper”; the Galilean with the feeding of the five thousand; the almost purely Gentile in Decapolis and its neighbourhood with the feeding of the four thousand, and the final Judæan with the Last Supper. There is no exception; teaching and healing first, then feeding. This age forgets the former and goes straight to the latter. If it would read *both* Thomas à Kempis and Mr. Stalker’s excellent little book before us—not one without the other—then it would deserve the name it so often gives itself, an age of progress. As it is, we fear in the end the old adage will apply to it—one-half the time of the wise is occupied in putting straight the blunders of the good. But we hope that nothing we have said will be misunderstood to mean that Mr. Stalker does not show himself quite aware of our rule, or in depreciation of his book, for it is both thoughtful and helpful.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRISTIAN GRATITUDE.

SIR,—“Presbyter” quotes: (1) “That we most show our gratitude to God by seeking further blessings at His hands”; and (2) “I do feel that I cannot offer any adequate return for His many blessings beyond that of a heart ready for more,” from me. He then affirms that these quotations do not harmonise with my sermon on “Christian Gratitude.” I hope he sees what his words imply, and that this will afford him food for reflection. Charity, as I take it, would have led him to suppose that as all came from the same source all would run on the same lines.

I have read the sermon through again to see if there were any reason for thinking otherwise. I find positively none. “Presbyter” reads his own thoughts with my words—or, perhaps to put it more correctly, he fails to grasp my meaning.

The point of the sermon was that we most show our gratitude to God for mercies received by offering hearts ready for more. When I used the expression,

“We are shut up,” to this method, of course it is quite clear that I could not have desired to exclude every other method of honouring God. The bare suggestion is puerile and absurd. And “Presbyter’s” arguments go on this supposition.

To make the bold statement, “The true and only way of showing gratitude to God for mercies received is the asking for more mercies,” is contrary to the whole spirit and tenour of the sermon. What are mercies? With some men they are nothing more than the things needful for this life. These may and may not be mercies in the strict sense of the word. Will “Presbyter” think out this thought, and then see if he does not see his way to withdraw his strictures?

The Psalmist’s other way of showing gratitude does not preclude, as any one may see, the best way of showing it. It may only have been preliminary to it. This is true also of St. Paul’s. When a man feels the vanity of this world he presents his whole being to be filled with the grace of God. This is a beautiful illustration of our point. Why do we give ourselves to God’s service, but to be filled with His Spirit? Surely “Presbyter” is scarcely fully alive to the meaning of the texts he is quoting!

“To him that hath more shall be given.” This text does not justify showing gratitude to God by asking for more; yet possessing much is made the condition of receiving more! And we are bidden to open our mouths wide, and He will fill them! “Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name, I will do it.” This does not encourage us to go in gratitude to God for mercies and plead the promise for more mercies! What, then, does it do? “Ask, and ye shall receive.” “Presbyter” allows this to be encouragement to prayer, but thinks there is nothing in it about gratitude. The very idea of prayer implies ill-desert; how, then, can we pray without gratitude? And so *ad lib.*

The truth is, I am afraid, that “Presbyter” does not like to admit that salvation is all of grace. He seeks to make room for human merit, and there is none—absolutely none. Will “Presbyter” let us see what he has to say on this point?

The interpretation of Mr. Murphy’s text, for which he has my best thanks, is: (1) It was grace to receive the law; it was grace to receive the Gospel; the Gospel takes the place of the law, and so “ye have received grace for grace.” (2) The one he gives. I do not see any difficulty in admitting the propriety of both. They run on the same lines.

I should be wanting in Christian courtesy if I failed to acknowledge my sincere appreciation of Mr. Murphy’s kind remarks respecting my sermon. I thank him very much for them, as also for the suggestion of the text—“Of His fulness have we all received and grace for grace.” It is to the point, and withal quite conclusive.

There is this remark that one ought to make. We have not time enough for our work. I cannot often write sermons. Whenever I do, I have to do it piecemeal—now a little and then a little. I have never time enough to consult books or look for texts. So, too often, the work is slipshod. I know such things ought not to be; but, under such high-pressure, what else can be done? I often think that our people have to be very indulgent to bear with our shortcomings. All this by way of apology.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage,
Nov. 9th, 1889.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—There are a few points in Mr. Donaldson's letter, printed by you this day, which need a reply.

On the possibility of spiritual truth being proved, he quotes : "Faith is the evidence, or proof, of things not seen." No doubt. This is mere definition. But it cannot be proof in the sense of demonstration, else faith would no more be faith, just as "hope that is seen is not hope, for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" (Romans viii. 24).

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." The word here translated *prove* is an altogether different word, and means, not *demonstrate*, but *test*.

It is a mere fact that St. Paul, in Philippians ii. 7, says that our Lord took the form of a bond-servant or slave. The original is *δούλου*.

It is, I believe, very doubtful whether *αἰών* (age) is derived from *ἀει ὄν* (always being). It has the appearance of a mere uncritical guess, and Aristotle is not a conclusive authority on Greek etymologies. But it is quite certain that *αἰώνιος* (eternal) is derived from *αἰών*. The word *αἰών* in the singular never means endless time; and there are two passages in the New Testament where *αἰώνιος* is applied to the time which began with Adam and ended with Christ, namely, 1 Timothy i. 9 and Titus i. 2, where the Old Testament had "*before the world began*," but the revisers have rightly substituted "*before times eternal*."

Mr. Donaldson cannot find the abolition of all enemies in 1 Cor. xv. He must then paraphrase the passage in question thus: "Christ will subdue all enemies, and abolish some of them; last of all bodily death, which shall be abolished by the resurrection of the body. But sin and spiritual death shall never be abolished; and when God, even the Father, is all in all, Satan shall reign throughout all ages over a kingdom of sin, death, and unreconciled, though vanquished, rebellion against God."

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, November 9th, 1889.

P.S.—On the meaning of the words "Grace for grace," I thoroughly agree with the exposition which "Presbyter" quotes from Westcott in THE PULPIT of this day.

SIR,—It seems clear to my own mind that well-meaning men may continue to wrangle interminably on the meaning of the Greek words, which have been rendered *everlasting* and *eternal* in the English Bible, without arriving at an agreement. My own impression is, that the words were not at first employed to convey the idea of *endlessness*, which was an after-growth, an accretion, an accommodated meaning.

I inquired four years ago concerning the strict force which those words possess of a clergyman who had been a fellow and tutor of Cambridge University. In his letter, now before me, he said: "The word *αἰώνιος*, derived from *αἰών*, age, is used in the earliest writers for a life-time, and afterwards for any complete period of time, like our *century*. It also stands for *eternity*, both in the loose sense of never-ending time, or the strict philosophical sense, in which, I think, it can only properly be predicated of God, to whom all ages are equally present, all summed up in the eternal *Now*. The adjective *αἰώνιος* has generally the force of *everlasting*, but it has also in Plato the strict force of *eternal*. In Ps. lxxvii. 5 it is employed by the LXX.,

where we have *ancient times*. I should say both words got used in the same loose way as the Latin *æternus*, or the English equivalent, and I think one should be very cautious of drawing any inference from their use as to duration or fixity of happiness or misery."

Very recently I asked a much esteemed clergyman to give me his opinion "as to whether an intelligent and conscientious searcher for truth is bound to acquiesce in the assertion, which has been, and still is, confidently put forth, that the Saviour enunciated the tremendous declaration that sin and misery will be endless?" His reply was: "My opinion has always been expressed clearly, that the unending sufferings of what are called the lost are not taught in the Scriptures, and imply a denial of the goodness of God, which is only another phrase for the denial of God."

As I see a reference to St. Chrysostom in the PULPIT of to-day, I will copy a few sentences among those which are given from his writings in "Primitive Universalism": "When sin shall no longer exist, it is evident that God shall be all in all. . . . It is then no evil to the offender to be punished, but that one so acting should not be punished (is an evil), just as for a sick man not to be cured. . . . It is right, then, to give thanks, not alone for the kingdom (of God), but for Gehenna as well." A man who wrote in that way could not have believed that the Saviour distinctly made known the endless existence of sin and misery.

There is a certain argument often brought forward with an air of triumph, and which I have seen lately several times. It appears to me destitute of force. The supposed dilemma is that if the punishment of the wicked is not endless, neither will be the felicity of the just. I believe the passage in question (Matt. xxv. 46) refers to an important age or era, when processes of a momentous nature will take place in regard to both classes. We have many other passages making known the gracious purposes of God towards all His creatures to prepare them for a safe, holy, and happy immortality. Such passages ought necessarily to control our interpretation of the severe texts.

J. B.

Canonbury, November 2nd, 1889.

GOD'S POWER TO FORGIVE SINS.

SIR,—Mr. Sandlands says that God cannot forgive sin. He ought not to utter the truth that he has got to enforce in this form. His real meaning does not contradict the Bible, but his words contradict the Bible flatly. God has chosen the atonement for sin made by His Son to be the means by which His forgiveness can reach sinners and blot out their sins. Relying on the infinite Divine wisdom, we believe that this method, of God's appointment, for the reconciliation of sinners to Himself, is the best possible method. But He might have chosen another method. That He chose the method that He did, and not another, ought to be enough for us, for God's ways, while not beyond our apprehension—that is our apprehension more or less thorough—are above our criticism.

Besides this, the habit of regarding the Atoning Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ as a kind of contrivance whereby God made it practicable to Himself to forgive the sins of men, is a bad habit. It contracts and limits the glorious fulness of the atonement. Our Lord suffered, the righteous for the unrighteous, *that*

He might bring us to God. The narrow view, far too common, fixes itself on Christ delivered for offences, and obscure, Christ raised again for our justification.

I think Mr. Sandlands judges his anecdote much too severely. Would not David, after the prophet's denunciation of his crimes against Uriah, have felt somewhat as the boy that killed the bird did? True spiritual repentance does not come at once. The self-accusing sinner must pass through an agony of sorrow before he can say, "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned."

Mr. Sandlands' sermons are better, and fairer, than his letters.

B.

GAMBLING.

SIR,—The Bishop of Peterborough seems to think that gambling is no sin in itself. I believe it is a sin in itself, no matter whether you bet a half-penny or a million of money. The State, no doubt, may draw the line anywhere it pleases, and make anything a *crime*—a crime even to whip your top or to sing the 10th Psalm. Most moralists divide all sins into two classes, primary and secondary. Aristotle, I think, makes all primary sins to be sins either of excess or defect. I am not aware that he ever laid down the same rule about secondary sins, such as lying, robbery, covetousness, or envy. Covetousness, I always thought, was stealing *in the heart*, and St. Paul says he never felt what sin was until he studied the 10th Commandment. Well, if covetousness be a secondary sin—a sin committed not for its own sake, but as a stepping-stone to something else—generally *money*—then, I, for one, cannot see how you can speak of moderate covetousness as you might, of moderate sleeping, or drinking, or eating. Covetousness, no doubt, is often, like all words used in many senses, but still I think among moralists covetousness means desiring your neighbours' property without an equivalent. If the man who bets merely to purchase a chance does not *rejoice with the winner*, whether the winner be himself or his enemy, then to talk of his merely and willingly purchasing a chance is naked bosh, if not something worse. The *Saturday Review* is quite welcome in calling all the opponents of the Bishop in this matter "Ranters or Canters," but the *Saturday Review* is very quickly stripping itself of all its former terrors in the world of literature, or politics, or religion, or ethics.

GEORGE WEBSTER.

Cork.

ADVERSARIA.

SIR,—In your issue of November 9th there are some things to which I trust you will let me call attention, in the hope, in one instance, of receiving information.

1. Canon Liddon, in his sermon on one portion of the *Magnificat*, says: "Elisabeth had wondered that Mary does not repudiate the honour," viz., the honour done her by God, in making her the vehicle of the Incarnation. May I venture to ask what authority can be given for this statement about Elisabeth's wonder? I have searched St. Luke in vain for anything resembling it.

2. In his letter in reply to Mr. Murphy, Mr. Donaldson says: "It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Murphy's habits of thought are not only not consonant to those of the Apostle (Paul)," but directly opposed to them. When the Apostle says 'Prove all things,' Mr. Murphy says 'No, we must not prove all things; for Mr. Matthew Arnold says, Truth is not to be proved, but seen.' And then he proceeds to show, as he thinks, to what sad mistakes Mr. Murphy's "disposition to believe things without proof" leads.

The word used by St. Paul in the passage quoted is *δοκιμάζω*. This does not mean to establish by argument, as it ought, if Mr. Donaldson's use of the passage is to be relevant, but to try, to test, to examine. Mr. Donaldson would have done well to learn a little Greek, before undertaking to confute Mr. Murphy out of St. Paul.

3. Again, Mr. Donaldson says, "As our Lord was never a bond-servant nor a slave" (pray what is the difference?), "the translation which makes him either the one or the other cannot be correct. With propriety, therefore, the Revised Version follows the Authorised Version, and translates it 'a servant,'" (Philippians ii. 7). This is a standard of translation which would make Scripture say not what it does say, but what its readers may think it ought to have said. In the margin, to which, by some curious fatality, the best renderings are usually relegated as well in the Revised as in the Authorised Version, the term "bond-servant" is given as the meaning of the Greek of St. Paul. St. Paul everywhere calls himself "the bond-servant" of Jesus Christ. But, forsooth, as St. Paul was a free Roman citizen, and could not therefore be the slave of any man, his expressions must be watered down by an impertinent explanation, instead of being accurately translated.

Probably Mr. Donaldson's reading has not made him acquainted with Mr. Murphy's works, else he would scarcely have ventured to write as follows regarding him: "I consider him as an estimable person in many ways, and would think more of him if he understood what is meant by a demonstration." Mr. Donaldson's own use of the word "demonstration" indicates that he knows as little about demonstration as he knows of Greek.

C. P. M.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

In the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

CANON WILBERFORCE preached a farewell sermon to the congregation of St. Mary's Church, Southampton, on Sunday week previous to his departure for India.

THE Bishop of Liverpool has accepted the chaplaincy of the old "First Lancashire," or 1st Volunteer Battalion of the King's Liverpool Regiment, in succession to the late Canon Stewart, rector of West Derby.

A PASTORAL staff is about to be presented to the Bishop of St. Asaph, designed by Mr. John D. Sedding. The subject in the crook is the "Charge of St. Peter," and below are two tiers of figures of the Welsh Saints. The material is silver, parcel gilt, inlaid with jewels.

WITH regard to the statements made as to the date when the proceedings against the Bishop of Lincoln will be resumed in the Archbishop's Court, we are in a position to say that his Grace has not yet fixed any date for the hearing of the suit against Dr. King on its merits. The technical preliminaries are not yet concluded.

AT Uppingham the first portion of the Edward Thring Memorial has been inaugurated, the western addition to the school chapel being opened by the Bishop of Peterborough. The new portion, of which Mr. A. E. Street is the architect, will contain the seated marble statue of the late head master, by Mr. Thomas Brock, and is built to seat ninety persons. A stained glass window, by Messrs. Clayton and Bell, has just been fixed.

THE Rev. J. F. Kershaw, M.A., vicar of St. John's, Kidderminster, has just resolved upon an act of noble self-sacrifice. An effort is being made to restore or rebuild the church. Money is urgently needed for that purpose. Mr. Kershaw resides at the vicarage, a well-appointed and spacious house in the west end of the borough. He has just let the residence to a physician who has retired from practice, and has taken for himself and his two curates three small cottages, at a rent of 5s. per week each, where they will in future reside, in the very heart of the parish. The money derived as rent from the vicarage will be applied to the church building fund. Such self-sacrificing efforts on the part of the leaders of the flock deserve success.—*Wolverhampton Express*.

A LETTER from the Archbishop of Canterbury has been received by the Rev. Dr. Falding, chairman of the Congregational Union, in acknowledgment of the resolution passed at the autumnal meetings held in Hull relative to the proposals for "Home Reunion." The reply says: "His Grace will have great pleasure in laying this letter before the Bishops at their next meeting in February. Whatever difficulties there may be in the way of closer union between the Church of England and the Nonconformist bodies, the Archbishop cannot but be grateful for the earnest and warm-hearted manner in which the subject has been and is being considered on all hands. He feels that such mutual consideration, and such general recognition of the evils of division, cannot but be a great step in the forward progress towards the goal so much desired by all."

CANON LUCKOCK's last lecture at Cambridge on the "Intermediate State" was delivered on Sunday night, when it was evident that the interest was unabated, for the church was completely filled. It is to be hoped that the lecturer will comply with a very

generally-expressed wish, and publish these lectures as a sequel to "After Death." The special topic he treated last Sunday was a question which would have been almost forbidden some years ago: "How far is the welfare of the dead a legitimate subject for the prayers of the living?" Canon Luckock set forth the historical evidence from our Lord's time, dwelling especially upon primitive ages and the Reformation epoch, and showing that at the latter epoch the practice was only overshadowed, not withdrawn. He then pointed out the objects for which it seemed lawful to offer prayer, whether public or private, and concluded with an urgent appeal to the audience to do their utmost to aid in reviving the practice.

THE Rev. Dr. Henry Bailey, late warden of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and now rector of West Tarring, Worthing, and Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, having expressed the wish to give £236 towards the endowment of a canonry in the cathedral, to be called the Canonry of St. Augustine, the Dean and Chapter have given their consent to the proposal. An agreement has been drawn up and has been approved by the Archbishop, as visitor of the cathedral, in which it is stated that Dr. Bailey shall be the first holder of the canonry, and that the following shall be the *status* and duties of the holder:—

(a) That he shall have no seat in the ordinary Chapter, nor any vote in matters relating to the receipts or expenditure of the Chapter.

(b) That the holder of the said canonry shall not be called upon to reside, unless by any further endowment an income of such an amount be provided as shall seem to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being sufficient to justify the holder being called upon to fulfil other requirements of residence and duty.

(c) That if and when such shall be the case a new scheme shall be prepared by the Dean and Chapter and laid before the Archbishop of Canterbury; and if, instead of endowing what is at present an honorary canonry, it seem advisable to re-endow a suspended canonry, then the Dean and Chapter, with the consent of the Archbishop, shall take such steps as may be necessary in order that such re-endowment may be effected in accordance with such Acts of Parliament as may then exist as governing such procedure.

(d) That the holder of the said canonry be required to preach once in the year in the said cathedral and metropolitan church if called upon by the Dean so to do, and once in the college of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, if in like manner requested by the Warden for the time being of the said college.

(e) That the said canonry shall be held for the term of the natural life of the holder, provided he be not incapacitated from performing the duties assigned to it, or appointed to some other cathedral preferment.

(f) That nothing in this scheme shall interfere with the patronage of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but the whole right of patronage of the canonry aforesaid shall remain vested in and may from time to time be exercised by the said Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and by his successors in the archbishopric.

The sum of £236 has been invested in New South Wales Three-and-a-Half per Cent. Stock, and has purchased the sum of £228 12s. 6d.; and it is the wish of the founder that the sermon be on some

subject connected with the foreign Missions of the Church, and that it be printed in the *Mission Field*, or some similar publication.

WHY do Bryant and May use the Ark as their trade mark?—Because the animals went in in pairs, and therefore the Ark must have been full of matches.

RESIGNATION OF A SUFFRAGAN BISHOP.—The *Central News* correspondent at Canterbury telegraphs that the Right Rev. Edward Parry, D.D., Oxford, Bishop Suffragan of Dover, Canon and Archdeacon of Canterbury, has resigned the bishopric owing to continued ill health. He was appointed Archdeacon and Canon of Canterbury in 1869, and in the following year Suffragan to Archbishop Tait. The resignation takes effect on January 1st next.

A PROTESTANT CHAPEL AT BETHLEHEM.—A Reuter's telegram, dated Constantinople, November 13th, says:—An Imperial Iradé issued to-day sanctions the erection at Bethlehem of a chapel for Protestant pilgrims to that place. The need for such an edifice has long been felt, and the Sultan's present decision is most gratifying to the German Empress, who has had the scheme particularly at heart.

CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY.—A sale of work and manufactures, and an exhibition of manufactures in working process, by workpeople from Church Pastoral Aid and other districts, will be held under the auspices of the Ladies' Home Mission Union, at Westminster Town-hall, on the 20th, 21st, and 22nd inst. The decorations will be carried out by Mr. G. M. Bridges, scenic decorator to the Prince of Wales, and the great hall will represent a street of Old London in the 17th century in mid-winter. The sale will be under distinguished patronage, and will be opened on Wednesday, the 20th inst., by the Countess of Harrowby.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allan, Rev. George Alexander, M.A.; Rector of Puckington, and Sinecure Rector of Bradon, Somersetshire.
 Anderton, Rev. R. F. R., Curate of Heapey, Chorley; Vicar of Hubberholme, Skipton.
 Asquith, Rev. Swithin; Principal of the English School, Lota, Chile, South America.
 Barnard, Rev. G. W., B.A., late Curate of St. Mary's, Bryans-ton-square; Vicar of Salter's-street, Tanworth.
 Brereton, Rev. Edward W., M.A., Rector of Linton-with-Hebden, Skipton; Vicar of St. James's, Bradford.
 Brooks, Rev. Henry Samuel, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist's, North Woolwich.
 Bunbury, Rev. Shirley, A.K.C.L.; Rector of Letcombe, Bassett, Berks.
 Callinan, Rev. T., M.A., Vicar of Bearpark; Secretary to the Durham Diocesan Branch of the C.E.T.S.
 Cronshaw, Rev. C., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Bolton; Vicar of West Houghton, near Bolton.
 De Cerfat, Rev. Charles Rowland Wynne; Vicar of Crowan, Cornwall.
 Dreaper, Rev. R. Walter S.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of London.
 Easterling, Rev. J. M.; Chaplain of the English Church, Tours.
 Edwards, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bradford; Honorary Canon in Ripon Cathedral.
 Edwards, Rev. W. G., B.A.; Vicar of St. Augustine's, Northam, Southampton.

Eliot, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Aston-juxta-Birmingham; Honorary Canon in Worcester Cathedral.
 Harrison, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas's, Liverpool; Rector of St. Mary's, Sandown Park, Wavertree.
 Hatfield, Rev. F. W.; Curate-in-Charge of Ravensthorpe, Mirfield.
 Hayward, Rev. Douglas Llewellyn, B.A.; Rector of Pitney, Somersetshire.
 Jones, Rev. Thomas Melville; Vicar of Pyle with Kenfig, Glamorganshire.
 Lancaster, Rev. Thomas, Curate at St. Anne's, Nottingham; Vicar of St. Paul's, Halliwell, Bolton-le-Moors.
 Law, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hammer-smith; Vicar of Rotherham, Yorkshire.
 Longlands, Rev. W. A., B.A.; Rector of Tibberton, Newport, Salop.
 Miller, Rev. H., M.A., Vicar of Ashbury, Berks; Rural Dean of the Vale of White Horse, Diocese of Oxford.
 Moffatt, Rev. John Adamson Stanley Paget, B.A.; Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
 Peet, Rev. Thomas, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
 Peter, Rev. L. G., M.A., Curate of Slade, near Stroud; Rector of East Quantoxhead, Somersetshire.
 Pitts, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Rector of Loughborough; Rural Dean of East Akeley.
 Raynes, Rev. Herbert Alfred, M.A.; Chaplain to Blundells School, Tiverton.
 Russell, Rev. Charles David, M.A.; Assistant-Inspector of Schools in the Deanery of Axbidge.
 Silver, Rev. Edgar, M.A., Incumbent of Portswood; Rural Dean of Southampton.
 Smith, Rev. Alexander Herbert Arthur, B.A.; Vicar of Lyng, Somersetshire.
 Smith, Rev. H. G. Brabant; Vicar of Elmdon, Essex.
 Spencer, Rev. Albert, M.A.; Vicar of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Primrose-hill.
 Spicer, Rev. Edward Clarke, M.A.; Rector of Throwleigh, Devonshire.
 Tottenham, Rev. Edward, Vicar of St. Ives; Vicar of Mading-le, Cambridge.
 Tutin, Rev. William Chomel; London Diocesan Home Missionary.
 Williams, Rev. Augustin, Rector of Todenham; Rector of Lemington, Moreton-in-the-Marsh, by dispensation from the Archbishop of Canterbury.
 Williams, Rev. E. C.; Rector of Threxton, Norfolk.
 Williams, Rev. Philip, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Matthias's, Plymouth.
 Wood, Rev. W. H.; Vicar of South Mimms, Barnet.
 Woodward, Rev. H. H., M.A., Minor Canon of Worcester and Warden of the Choir School; Precentor of Worcester Cathedral.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bowmar, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar, at Mears Ashby Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 58.
 Clay, Rev. W. French, M.A., M.D., M.R.C.S., late of the Indian Medical Service, Bombay, at Clapham, on the 9th inst., aged 67.
 France-Hayhurst, Rev. Thomas, Canon of Chester, at Davenham Rectory, on the 5th inst., aged 86.
 Lewis, Rev. Arthur Augustus, at Lindridge House, Tenby, on the 3rd inst., aged 68.
 Sweet-Escott, Rev. W. W., M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, Head Master of King Henry VIII. School, Coventry, at the School House, Coventry, on the 7th inst., aged 40.
 Weldon, Rev. George Warburton, Vicar of Bickley, on the 9th inst., aged 64.



The Church of England Pulpit.

GOD'S POWER.

BY THE REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL,
SUNDAY, AUGUST 18TH, 1889.

"He hath shown strength with His arm, He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart. He hath put down princes from their thrones, and hath exalted them of low degree. The hungry He hath filled with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away."—ST. LUKE i. 51-53.

BETWEEN the second strophe of the *Magnificat* which we were considering a week ago, and the third, which is before us to-day, there is a contrast which makes the transition from one to the other appear somewhat abrupt. In the second strophe, so far as her humility and self-repression would permit, Mary was speaking of herself; she foretold her place throughout all time in the memories and the hearts of men. She touched upon the great things which God had done unto her; she was not excluding reference to herself even when she sang of that mercy of God which unto all generations is on them that fear Him. But in the strophe which is before us to-day she is surveying the wide field of human history; she sees God's arm of power displayed in it; she notes the changes which God makes in the fortunes of nations and of dynasties, and His rule of action in the kingdom of grace. "He hath showed strength with His arm. He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down princes from their thrones, and hath exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, the rich He hath sent empty away."

Now, what is the connection between that more personal history and this larger survey of the connection of God in the civil and religious affairs of man? How does Mary come to have passed so rapidly from one to the other? Reflect here, my brethren, on a common experience of the human mind in all ages, whether in the sphere of inspiration or beyond it. At times of deeply moved feelings, whether of joy or sorrow, the soul of man is raised above the level of its average existence, and enjoys the command of a larger outlook. The pettier cares of life are lost sight of in these movements of unwonted elevation, and wide and extended horizons which are ordinarily beyond the range of sight come clearly into view. From the crest of

the wave that is bearing him to some unknown shore, the mariner looks out for an instant on a distant prospect, it may be of a precipitous cliff, it may be of hills and valleys and peaceful homesteads, and all that recalls the security of a landsman's life, though as he gazes he sinks forthwith into the trough of the sea; and the human soul, too, is able, when borne upward by a wave of feeling, to perceive larger fields of truth than usual, even though the vision should pass almost as soon as it has been enjoyed. Something of this kind has often been observed at the approach of death. Men who are not generally given to hazard predictions, or even enunciate general principles, will sometimes speak from a death-bed as though they were invested with a kind of prophetic character, so large their range of view, so clear, so confident their opinions as to what will or will not take place in certain departments of life after they are gone. And a great joy will sometimes have a like result, and we have observed how the recovery from an extremity of illness, or the birth of a son, or an unlooked-for deliverance from impending ruin, will lead even ordinarily taciturn people to speculate about the influences which govern human life, and with which they feel themselves for the moment to be in vivid contact. Mary's inspiration would not have withdrawn her from the operation of this law of the particular kind of illumination which is attendant on certain states of elevated feelings. Her own experience would lead her to reflect on God's general principles of government, for the principles on which God deals with single souls are the same principles as those which control His dealings with nations and races and churches. The difference lies in the scale of their application. When Isaac Newton saw an apple fall from a tree, and had asked himself why it did not go upwards instead of downwards, he had discovered the great law which governs the movements of the heavenly bodies; and when Mary surveyed her own history clearly she recognised the universal principles of God's government of the world. She was a descendant of David's line, and she knew that in the past her ancestors had been put down from their thrones, while she, in her low estate, had been secretly exalted to a far higher honour than can be conferred by an earthly crown. Like every true Israelite, she had often longed to see God's promised salvation; and lo! she herself was to be the mother of the Promised One. Such experiences could not but lead her to consider the general truths which they so strikingly illustrated; but before she announced them she pauses to do homage to a fact which takes precedence even of these truths, and which throws them out into their full relief. That fact is the active, the never-failing providence of Him who keepeth all things, both in heaven and in earth. No fact is perhaps so widely confessed and practically so forgotten as God's action on the affairs of the world and on

men's separate lives. Yet for those who believe in God this fact may always be verified, since it explains much which takes place, if much also takes place which to our apprehensions it does not explain. We may reflect that alike in what He does and in what He permits, God, as the infinite Being, naturally does and allows much which we cannot understand. But Mary sings, "He hath showed strength with His arm." The human arm represents man's working power; the arm executes the order of the will, and it is in the vigorous, quickly moving arm we recognise a will of energy and decision. Thus in the language of the Hebrews the word "arm" was generally used in the sense of power, as when the man of God prophesied to Eli the downfall of his family. "Behold the days come that I will cut off thine arm, and the arm of thy father's house"; or when Jeremiah exclaimed, "The arm of Moab is broken"; or when Ezekiel, speaking in the name of God, says, "I have broken the arm of Pharaoh, king of Egypt." A word thus used to denote human power was naturally transferred to the Divine, without, of course, implying in the Divine Being, in the ages before the Incarnation, any likeness to the human form. Thus, again and again God is said to deliver His people from Egypt and from later oppressors "with an outstretched arm," that is, by special exertion of His power; and a psalmist sings how that God "with His own right hand and with His holy arm hath gotten Himself the victory"; and another psalmist that "He hath scattered His name abroad with His mighty arm." Isaiah speaks of God "judging His people with His arm," and he predicts that "the arm of the Lord shall be on the Chaldeans," and he invokes the Divine attribute of power in favour of Israel: "Awake, awake, put on Thy strength, O arm of the Lord"; and He asks with reference to the Redeemer, considered as embodying and exhibiting the power of God, "To whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?" These, as all readers of their Bibles would know, are only a few of the passages which might be quoted, so that Mary was using old and Scriptural language when she described God's power by the metaphor of His arm.

And what does she mean by suggesting that God showed strength with His arm? Clearly that His incessant energy had brought about particular results which were calculated to impress the minds of men with a sense of His power as vividly as though they had seen the heavens open and an arm of irresistible might stretched out to shape the course of men and events according to the good pleasure of the invisible Being whose arm it was.

Let us observe that one of the principal uses of the historical books of the Old Testament is to accustom us to look at all human history in this way, to see God's hand and arm in it, to trace in it the strong action of His holy will. He is not less present in English than in Jewish history, nor

has He less concern with our separate lives than with those of the forefathers, and heroes, and saints of Israel. The great difference is that, as a rule, we do not see Him as they did. Mary, at any rate, before she goes further, will not leave the matter in doubt. "God," she says, "hath showed strength with His arm."

She passes on to note one particular series of events moving through long periods of history, in which this action of the arm of God is especially manifested: "He hath scattered the insolently proud in [or by] the imagination of their hearts, He hath put down princes from their thrones; He hath exalted them of low degree." Mary here, it seems, looks backward and forward; she is at once historian and prophetess. She is proclaiming principles of the Divine government which will be as true in the remoter future as they have been in the distant past. She looks backwards over the ages of history, and she beholds kingdoms which have fallen from great prosperity into utter ruin, and princes whose names were once the terror of the world, and whose thrones have long since been vacant, or have been humbled to the dust. "He hath scattered the proud," or, literally, "the insolently proud." The word which she uses accurately describes the prevailing temper of the average occupants of an Eastern throne. It is the temper which is naturally produced by a long-continued success; by the accumulation of much wealth and power. We see it in a small scale in men of private life among ourselves, who have had everything their own way; who have made money rapidly; who have achieved social, perhaps political importance; who, above all, have had many years of unbroken health. To prosper in this way and to remain humble, self-distrustful, unselfish, mindful of the real conditions of life, mindful of the nearness of death, and of the weakness of the strongest man, and of the awful presence and power which is around and which is above us—that is the exception rather than the rule. The rule is, that when men in such a position are not under the direct influence of religion, they become haughty and self-asserting, even when they have sufficient good taste, as distinct from religious principle, to check the exuberant exhibition of these tendencies in what they do and say. But if this is the case on a small scale in Christendom and in private life, think what must happen to a man in the position of one of the ancient kings of Egypt or Assyria, with unchecked power over the lives and fortunes of his subjects, with vast wealth, large armies, and a great company of accomplished slaves altogether at his disposal. Wonderful, indeed, it would be, if without the control of true religion the heart of a man in such a position did not swell with an intolerable pride, wonderful if he did not altogether lose sight of the real measures of things, of the place of every mortal man in the universe of God, of his true relations with God

and with his brother man. Mary knows all this, and thus she sings of God "scattering the insolently proud in"—or, rather, by—"the imagination of their hearts." The false estimate of self, of men and things, which is engendered by the temper in question is constantly fatal to the very position which has appeared to warrant it. That temper overrates its resources, it underrates the resources of others; it underrates material wealth or power; it underrates the strength of those moral convictions which lie deep in the hearts of millions of men; it is so inflated by the successes of the past that it cannot coolly take account of the contingencies of the future; it is so full of its Vienna and its Austerlitz that it cannot anticipate what may happen amid the snows of Russia, or during a retreat from Moscow. It is not a particularity of the ancient, as also it is not a particularity of the modern world; it is not less true in public life than in private life, that God scatters to the winds the insolence which is too full of self to recognise the conditions with which any position whatever is held in this world by any man or any nation at all. Mary, no doubt, would often have heard her parents talk over the story of the fall of those ancestors of hers and theirs who last sat in Jerusalem on the throne of David—such men as Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, how far the temper and conduct of their predecessors and their own had helped to bring it all about, and the solemn truths which inspired those warnings of Jeremiah, which, to the last kings of Judah and to their courtiers, seemed to be so disloyal, so unpatriotic. But if these monarchs of what was only an inconsiderable state had to learn truth, their fall was in the outward scale of nations as nothing compared with that of the occupants of the mighty thrones all around them. The Egyptian hieroglyphics and the cuneiform characters have yielded up their secrets to the industry of modern scholars, and we have to-day before our eyes proud inscriptions in which the old kings of Egypt and Assyria announced their will, or proclaimed their triumphs to their subjects or to the world. Nothing is more remarkable in these inscriptions than the astonishing self-assertion which inspires them from first to last. They are the language of men who sincerely believe that there are no bounds to their power, and that to traverse their will is an unpardonable crime. The Egyptian kings held quite seriously that they were deities in human form, and they spoke and acted accordingly. The Bible bears out the witness of the inscriptions to the temper of ancient monarchies. Ezekiel records the saying of a contemporary Pharaoh about the Nile: "My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself." Daniel tells us that Nebuchadnezzar walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon, and the king spake and said: "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my

power, and for the honour of my majesty?" And how does Ezekiel address a much less considerable potentate than these, the Prince of Tyre? "Thine heart is lifted up, thou hast said: I am a god, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas."

And in a later age there was a scene at Cæsarea which illustrates the points before us, when Herod, arrayed in royal apparel, sat upon his throne and made an oration to the embassies from Tyre and Sidon, and the people, unchecked, it would seem, gave a shout, saying, "It is a voice of a god and not of a man." Mary knew what happened to Egypt, she knew what had been the fate of Tyre and of Babylon; before her eyes there passed a long procession of vacant and ruined thrones. Assyria had gone down before Babylon, Babylon and Egypt had gone down before the Persians, and the Persians in their turn before the great Alexander. Alexander's generals in Egypt and in Syria had set up monarchies which in their turns oppressed Israel in the later stages of its history. Never did a country go through a more exhausting struggle for its very life than did the Jews under the Maccabees; but those oppressors, too, had lately gone their way. Egypt and Syria had alike been humbled, utterly humbled, before the Roman power; and it might be said that when Mary sang, the East was still echoing to the crash of falling thrones; and one power remained supreme on earth at least to the apprehension of populations that had never heard of the events then going on in India and China; one power remained, the power of imperial Rome. But Mary is a prophetess, not less than an historian, and as she could fortell her own place in the memory of the grateful Church, so she could divine, though afar off, what would happen to the great world empire. True, she speaks of what God has done: "He hath scattered," "He hath put down," "He hath exalted," "He hath filled," "He hath sent away"; but this is sometimes the style of a prophet, who is by no means bound to use a future sense when he is fortelling a future time. The vision of the future passes before the prophet's soul, and he describes what he sees as actually occurring, or as already accomplished; and thus it is that Isaiah, more especially in the latter part of his book, fortells the captivity in Babylon as if it were a state of things in the midst of which he himself was actually living. And the prophets sometimes used a past tense quite advisedly as expressing, as vividly as possible, their conviction that the predicted future is quite as certain as the past. When, then, Mary speaks of His putting down princes from their thrones, she may well mean Roman emperors in the future, no less than the dynasties which had long since ceased to rule on the Nile and on the Euphrates. When Mary sang Rome was at the height of her power, the greatest part of the world, of the known world, obeyed her laws; her legions had

planted her eagles on the Rhine, on the Danube, on the Euphrates, on the Nile, on the sands of Africa; and her civilisation, with its blessings and its vices, her institutions, her manners and customs, even her language had followed them. The world was already Rome, not only in name, but, to a large extent, in sympathy and purpose, and no social and political fabric that had ever bound civilised men together seemed to be so strong or so durable as that which stood around the throne of the Cæsars.

And yet the causes which brought about the downfall of her power were at work within the great empire. Material splendour had blinded men's eyes to the secret symptoms of decay, to the natural principles and virtues which alone could avert it, and at last the crash came. It nearly came in the third century after Christ, two hundred years before its time. It came with overwhelming terrors in the fifth century, when Goths, and Huns, and Vandals and Lombards swept like a wave of angry men over the wreck of the old civilisation, and at last were the words which St. John had heard in vision fulfilled, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen."

But the work of the arm of the Lord, as Mary watches it from afar, is not merely or chiefly destructive; it scatters and destroys only that it may gather and rebuild. As the Church says, with such truth and beauty, "God declareth His almighty power most chiefly in showing mercy and pity." When Mary sings that God "had exalted the humble and meek," or rather "them of low estate," she may well be thinking of the people of Israel among the nations of the world, surrounded by mighty monarchies, while itself occupying a territory not very much larger than a large English county, and yet designed to be the people of revelation, and to exercise an altogether unrivalled influence on the future of the human race. Or she may have in her mind such careers as those of Joseph in one age at the court of Egypt, or of Daniel and Esther in another at the courts of Babylon and Persia. But she cannot but also have reflected on the high honour put upon herself. What royal distinctions were in reality even comparable to hers, who was the chosen mother of Emmanuel, her of whom, as St. Paul said to her race, "As concerning the flesh Christ came. Who is over all, God, blessed for ever?"

And may we not here also observe that what she says has a reference to the future as well as to the past? Does she not also describe a far-off time, when the disciples of the Crucified would succeed to the empire of the world, when the meek would inherit the earth, and would be refreshed in the multitude of peace? The triumph of Christianity, notwithstanding the faults of individual Christians, or of politicians like Constantine, who brought it about, was, on the whole, a victory of purity and patience, of humility and conscientious-

ness, over the corruption and violence, the pride, the lack of moral principles, which had so characterised the social fabric of the old empire; and Mary saw it coming from afar; she saw that it was involved in the angel's promise respecting her Son: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end." How far happier would men be if they could only be sure that their future place in another life, if not in this, will be the reverse, I do not say of their place, but of their temper, whether of self-effacement or of self-assertion, in this. Doubtless, there have been paupers who have cherished in their rags the pride of discontent in a measure not unworthy of Sennacherib, and there have been kings whom coronets and sceptres and the fascinations of power and the adulations of a court have not rendered incapable of cultivating the humble and patient temper of a Christian saint. The position counts for much less than the temper. As it is the self-asserting temper which God deposes from its throne of pride, so it is the self-renouncing temper which He exalts to His realm of glory. How could it be otherwise when He Himself, being in the form of God, and not deeming His equality with God a prize to be eagerly grasped, emptied Himself of His glory and took on Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man—and why? In order that this same mind might be in us which was also in Himself, Christ Jesus. And what wonder is it that the mother of the Incarnate God should proclaim a moral truth which is the very first lesson of the Divine Incarnation?

And corresponding with this law of depression of the insolent, and the exaltation of the unpretending is God's rule of administration in the spiritual world. They who are sensible of their needs and deficiencies, they who are seeking truth, and longing for Christ, are sooner or later satisfied. They who deem themselves to have no need of anything from on high, who are sure that they see at once to the bottom of every question, who hold that they can do right without any aid whatever from the Author of all Good, the self-reliant and the self-complacent—these men are excluded from all share in the Divine bounty. "He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away." This principle that a sense and confession of want must precede in intelligent men any communication of God's best blessings is in keeping, as Mary's metaphor suggests, with the law of Nature. If food is to invigorate the human body, if it is not to be an encumbrance and a cause of discomfort and disease, it must be welcomed by appetite. Appetite is Nature's own certificate that food will not be injurious; and if a soul is to be benefited by truth or grace that soul must desire it. Nothing is more constantly taught us in Holy Scripture than this; and from this fact there follows another—namely, that God

withholds these blessings when men do not seek them. This is the constant teaching of the Old Testament—"Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it." "Call upon Me," says God "by the mouth of Jeremiah to Israel," "Call upon Me and I will answer thee, and show thee great and mighty things that thou knowest not of." "If," says Solomon, "thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding, if thou seekest her as silver and searchest for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God." So a psalmist during the exile sings: "Blessed are they that keep God's testimonies, and seek Him with their whole heart. I have had as great delight in the way of Thy testimonies as in all manner of riches. Open Thou mine eyes, that I may see wondrous things out of Thy law. My soul hath longed for Thy salvation, and I have a good hope because of Thy word; mine eyes long sore for Thy word, saying, O when wilt Thou comfort me."

These teachings and these passages would have been familiar to Mary from her earliest years, and her Son and Lord confirmed their import in after years. "Ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you; for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." On the other hand, Mary proclaims that the rich God hath sent empty away. God does not force Himself on those who think they can do without Him. He offers them His good things, and if He meets with the indifference of an imaginary sufficiency, He passes on. They who deem themselves too well off to need Him are taken at their word. They cannot complain if it is so. So it was in the days of our Lord and His apostles. Herod, Pilate, Felix, all came quite close to truth; all were sent away empty, while Simeon and Hannah, and then first one, and then another apostle, the fisherman, the tax-gatherer, the tent-maker, Cornelius the centurion—these were filled with the good things of faith in the unseen, and hope in the imperishable inheritance of love towards God and man. And as with individuals, so with classes of men. The average Greek, satisfied with his shallow pride of culture, had no eye for the realities of the moral world or for his own deep need of pardon and grace. He toyed with some one of the current philosophies, and if it told nothing certainly about those things which it the most concerns a thinking man to know, it at least produced in him a tranquil sense of satisfaction with his own power. That self-complacent life of the average Jew—he was either a hard-hearted sceptic like the Sadducees, or he was a man of phrasings and forms only like the Pharisee, who is apostrophised by St. Paul: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest His will, and approvest the things that are most excellent,

being instructed out of the law, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light to them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law." This is a picture of the temper of a great number of men in the apostolic times, and we can understand how in such a state of mind "they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, went about to establish their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God." The earlier chapters of the Epistle to the Romans are devoted to breaking down, in Gentile and Jew alike, this fatal temper of satisfaction with self, and to proving that, since all the world is certainly guilty before an all-holy God, all need the gift of pardon and of peace which is offered by His Blessed Son, incarnate and crucified for men.

And this consideration may enable us, in conclusion, to answer two questions which are very often asked nowadays, and which are very practical indeed in their bearings. The first is, "Why do so many people, who have opportunities of knowing Christian truth, and have good natural abilities and education, often know so little about its real character?" The answer, at least in a great many cases, is that they do not make a serious effort to find out what it is. They take it for granted that, while they cannot master a science or learn a new language without taking serious trouble, religious truth will come to them somehow, as a matter of course. They have heard something about it many years ago, and that, they think, will probably do. They give the real energy, the real vigour of their minds to the things of this world; they give a few spare moments to religion. "Religion," they say to themselves, by way of excuse, "being meant for all, can easily be explained with a very little trouble by any person of average ability, and to spend too much trouble on it would be a waste of time." Natural ability can master the surroundings of religion—the evidences on which the Creed depends, the historical circumstances which accompanied the appearance of our Lord among men, the outline and the history of the Christian Church, the controversies which have arisen on religious matters from century to century—but the essential point, the appeal which our Lord and Saviour makes to the moral and spiritual faculty in every man, has nothing to do with accomplishments as an athlete or an artist; and, unless the spiritual faculty is on the alert, hungering to be satisfied with the good things of God, religious truth falls dead upon the soul, whatever a man's natural abilities may be. It is one thing to read about religion, to use religious language—a good thing, I admit, as far as it goes—but it is another to perceive its reality from its perfect adaptation to the wants and the aspirations of our own single souls. And this perception is impossible if we allow ourselves to think that, as we know all

about it, there is no need for further trouble. However much he may have learned about God, a true Christian is always learning, and he knows that since he, a finite being, is face to face with the Infinite, there must always be something, or rather much, to learn. He is always forgetting those things that are behind, and reaching forward to those that are before. The moment he ceases to do this, ceases to desire to know more of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, the pores of the soul forthwith close up, and a process of spiritual atrophy begins to develop itself. To him, as well as to souls that are choked with the riches and pleasures of this life, is addressed the solemn warning: "Because thou sayest, I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. I counsel thee to buy of the gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear, and to anoint thine eyes with eyesalve that thou mayest see."

And the other question is: Why do so many of us apparently get so little moral and spiritual strength from receiving the Holy Communion? Considering what that sacrament really is, and who it is that we meet in it, and the purpose with which He comes to us, we may wonder that it is in many cases to all appearance so unfruitful in spiritual results. Well, my brethren, there may be some other answers to a most important question, but one answer, doubtless, is that we do not sufficiently long for it. Our Lord Himself said at the last Passover at which He met His disciples, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer," and every communicant ought to be able to say quite sincerely to our Lord before each communion, "With desire have I desired to receive this Thy sacrament once more before I die." Such desire must grow out of, and be prompted by, an unaffected sense of our weakness—nay, of our utter impotence, without the strengthening presence and aid of Jesus Christ our Lord. But to a soul that has any true relish for spiritual things this desire is not less spontaneous than is the craving for food in a hungry man. Such desire prompts and guides preparation for communion, review of conscience, confession of sins, prayers for the dispositions, for repentance, faith, and love which befit the approach to the great means of grace. This spirit is that of the old Psalmist in exile on the hills of Bashan, who, as his thoughts wandered to the services in the distant Temple, beheld, it would seem, at his feet the wild gazelles tracking the water-course that followed the mountain side in search of a spring that might slake their thirst. "Like as the hart desireth the water brook, so longeth my soul after Thee, O God. My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God. When shall I come to

appear before the presence of God?" May our Lord Jesus Christ of His great mercy empty us of all self, of all which makes us so satisfied with ourselves as to make us inaccessible to His supreme attractions; may we both here and hereafter obtain those promises which exceed all that we can desire.

PERSONAL INFLUENCE.

BY THE REV. THOMAS FIELD, M.A., HEAD MASTER OF THE KING'S SCHOOL, CANTERBURY, LATE ASSISTANT MASTER AT HARROW.

SERMON PREACHED IN HARROW SCHOOL CHAPEL, AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE FOUNDER, JOHN LYON, AND OTHER BENEFACTORS OF THE SCHOOL, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10TH, 1889.

"That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection."—PHIL. iii. 10.

KNOW Him—a person—and what is history but the chronicle of personal achievements and the results of personal work? There is, it is true, another view of history which turns our thoughts away from individuals, and fixes them on abstract principles and general results rather than on the men and women who struggled for them and secured them. It tells us that if such and such a person had not lived the same or similar results would have been brought about in another way: that if Luther had not lived the yoke of Rome must have been broken in time; that if Alexander had not lived the unwieldy fabric of the Persian empire would have fallen to pieces otherwise; that if Julius Cæsar had not laid the foundations of the imperial power at Rome, emperors would have risen from the force of circumstance. Such is the view of a foreign novelist whose works are attracting much attention now. He seems to think that Napoleon's greatest battles were won not by his genius, but by accident or the force of circumstances; that so long as these circumstances were favourable the issue was success; when the tide of fortune turned the issue was disaster, but that the smallest factor in all this business was Napoleon's genius. He regards the history of mankind as the progress of a great and complicated engine, where wheels work on wheels, interdependent and intertwined with one another, but where the general course of its work cannot depend on any single wheel. This may be the more philosophic view of history, but for us at school it is not that to which we are accustomed, it is not that which appeals naturally to boys. Certainly our imagination is first captivated, not by the working out of great results, but by the influence of great characters. It is the individual hero who charms us, we follow his rise to fame with excitement, we think of his achievements with wonder, we see the results of his life work with surprise and astonishment. Follow the history of

the chosen people, blot out from its pages Moses and Joshua, Samuel and Elijah, David and Solomon, Ezra and Nehemiah; listen to the philosopher who tells you that the work of Moses was quite an accident, the force of circumstances would have led the Israelites out of Egypt even if they had not secured a leader of so marked a personality, how soon all that charms us in the history is lost. The mere fact that Athens grew to greatness and again decayed is in itself not of thrilling interest; dissociate it from the lives of the heroes like Themistocles and Pericles who built her fortunes, and who, like Demosthenes, struggled in vain to postpone her fall, what a desert would history appear. Take the noble hymn in your hymn books which thanks God for the blessings He has vouchsafed to our land, see how it centres lovingly on personal memories.

On that island throne have sate
Alfred's goodness, Edward's state.
Round that throne have stood of old
Seers and Statesmen firm and bold,
Burghley's wisdom, Hampden's fire,
Chatham's force in son and sire.

The philosophy of history may lie in its principles, but the poetry (yes, and the deepest teaching) of history lies in its men. And what is true of a nation we feel also to be true of a school. How do we think to-day of the beginning of Harrow? In Elizabeth's reign there was a new feeling in the air, a revived interest in study, a desire to improve education. As a result of this tendency many schools were founded; the product of the Elizabethan age we call them. All this is true, but it does not touch our feelings or stir our emotions. What interests us is that this general feeling and desire rooted itself in the mind of one definite person, it stirred in a human heart, it prompted human generosity, it took shape in personal thought and care and sacrifice

When Lyon dreamed and saw in dream
His race of sons to follow.

Some schools are founded by limited companies to whom personal devotion can hardly be felt; but it is good for us, is it not, to continue to regard with affectionate veneration, the simple yeoman to whose warm-hearted generosity our beginnings are due. Then when we follow the history of the school it is a process of change, of growth, of development, of enrichment. But on Founder's day we link each stage of this progress with well-loved names; there is the long list of benefactors whose names are remembered, and some there be who have no memorial, possibly not the least but the greatest of the benefactors of Harrow. Yes, this progress is the work of human hearts, longing, loving, striving; these gifts are the tokens of personal affection, loyal, loving, self-sacrificing. There are changes in the school system, we say; they are demanded by the spirit of the age, the tendency of our times. Yes, so they are, but they

bear the impress of individual genius, and will be remembered as the work of single minds. To mention one example we say that our times have seen a great increase in the love of music in England, in London, and therefore naturally in English schools; but do we think of music here as caused by a tendency? Shall we not always, whatever improvements it may see hereafter—shall shall we not always, I say—remember the enthusiastic lover of Harrow who first made music a part of the school life as a whole. It was a personal work, and bears, and will bear, the traces of the genius from which it sprang. But boys have a history as well as a school, and how is that history moulded? People speak of the tone of a school, the tone of a house, the tone of a form, its industry, its honesty, its energy. Yes, but what do you mean by tone? You mean the influence, the character of individuals. A boy says such and such a house was a bad house in my time; he means that there were this, that, and the other bad boys in it—boys with individual knowledge of good and evil, individual responsibilities to their God; and when they speak of a form as a good form, what are they thinking of but the personal influence of the master? A form is no machine, it is a collection of human souls, raised or lowered, stimulated or depressed by the looks, the words, the sympathies of one individual. To whom can this thought come home so powerfully as to one who still sees among those who are listening to him boys for whom he once bore this solemn responsibility.

Once when I knelt before the Archbishop to receive the great commission of priesthood in the Church of Christ these solemn and mysterious words were said to me: "Whosoever sins thou dost remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins thou dost retain they are retained." What do they mean? They mean many things, but they seemed to say at least this to me. There will be entrusted to you human souls, liable to sinful passions, set amongst sinful temptations, with natures prone to yield, easily led, impressionable, eager, seeing the right and longing for it, yet drawn by the mysterious attraction of evil; by your prayers they may be inspired, by your sympathies they may be attracted, by your example they may be raised, by your influence what is sinful in them may be overcome, and every instinct after holiness may be developed, or, which God forbid, by your neglect they may be lowered, by your coldness they may be repelled, by your example they may be degraded. In this sense every man, aye, and every boy is a priest to his brother, by his influence the bonds of sinful habits may be rivetted or broken, the force of sinful passion weakened or increased, the keenness of sinful temptations sharpened or blunted. Whosoever sins he remits they are remitted unto them; whosoever sins he retains they are retained. When you come

back, as some have come to-day, to a place where they have spent their boyhood, your thoughts will be revolving many memories, scenes of happiness and success, of failure and temptation, of kindness and unkindness, of help or hindrance; but they will link themselves about individual boys whom you remember, single incidents will rise in your recollection, it was so and so who tried to tempt me to this bad act, it was that other who warned me when I first came of that danger, it was a third who spoke to me words of kindness when I wanted it most. This I know was my feeling when I returned to the school where I was taught; for if in any sense the life there has a deeper and more sacred interest it is because every stone and every corner is linked with memories of the personal influences that moulded for good or evil the most impressionable years of my life-time; and in the retrospect which is forced upon me, and to which a reference may be pardoned to-day, does one think of eight years at Harrow merely as a period of happiness, a period of education, a period of growth? Is it not rather rich with keenly treasured incidents of personal struggles and associations and friendships? Yes, in looking back, one does not now, and you will not hereafter, look at or think of the general results. Life does not present itself as a whole, it breaks up into single events, single words, single emotions, single battles with one's self, single attachments, single friendships. Precisely the same is it with our faith. What is the object of our religious life but to know God—to know Him—not as He is spoken of in the philosophic phrase as a tendency towards righteousness, or as a vague principle of justice, purity and truth, not as an conception or idea, but as a living, loving Father. It is in this personal relation to us as our Father that God inspires the love and claims the allegiance of the souls of men. And what of Him whom we call Jesus of Nazareth? What was the force which changed the life of St. Paul? He heard a voice saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me." It was a voice of personal pleading. And again it said, "Thou art a chosen vessel unto me." It was a word of personal choice. Once more, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." It was a voice of personal command. Henceforth his life acknowledged one master, one duty. Have you heard that voice? To hear it is the beginning of the religious feeling, to answer it is the work of the religious life. Principles and tendencies may satisfy the heads and intellects of men, their hearts, their love, their loyalty, their devotion, demands a person.

Wordsworth describes one sunrise of marvellous beauty when there came to him a consciousness of the work whereto God had called him:

My heart was full, I made no vows, but vows
Were then made for me, bond unknown to me
Was given that I should be, else sinning greatly,
A dedicated spirit.

Has that sunrise risen on your life and shown you that you must be "else sinning greatly dedicated spirits?" Have you heard that voice of pleading, that assurance of choice, that great command. To some it comes as to Saul the King, and Saul the Apostle at a moment they remember, and at a definite place. Gray describes bards and sages learning from heaven—

To bless the place where on their opening soul
First the genuine ardour stole.

The time might be a Founder's day, the place might be this Harrow chapel. Oh, my friends, who could speak to you as I am speaking unless he believed that he had heard that voice, however dimly, that he had striven and was striving to answer it, however feebly; unless indeed he believed that in his prayers he had known that he was speaking to a Saviour, and that Saviour was speaking to him, a Saviour who in the communion of His body and blood fulfilled His promise to be one with us, and make us one with Him. When or how this voice came to me I know not, but I do know that words which once fell idly on my ears have now found an interpretation in the experience of life. "I am not my own, I am bought with a price." "That I may know Him and the power of His resurrection."

THE dedicatory service at St. Clement Danes, Strand, of which the Rev. J. J. H. Septimus Pennington is the new rector, will be held on Friday evening, November 22nd, when a sermon will be preached at 8 p.m. by the former rector, the Rev. R. J. Simpson, vicar of St. Peter's, Eltham; and on Sunday sermons will be preached by the Rev. Thomas Moore, rector of Allhallows the Greater and Less. The subject at the morning service will be "What is the story of St. Clement, and what its teaching?" and at the 7 p.m. service, "What should be the characteristic mission of a church dedicated to St. Clement, such as St. Clement Danes?"

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PAMPHLET
and Advice
FREE

Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to **MR. C. B. HARNESSES.** Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his New Medical Work, entitled **"Harnesse's Guide to Health,"** which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harnesse's Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. **MR. C. B. HARNESSES** also gives Advice (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1889.

"UNDENOMINATIONALISM."

THERE is no class of men who are so dangerous to the growth of Christianity in this country as the Undenominational Christian. He is an anomaly, and we venture to believe that few such really exist. He is a man sailing under false colours, professing no bias, but in reality having a very strong one. Undenominationalism is another name for Dissent. "Are not all the Lord's people priests?" is the common cry now among Dissenters, as of old. And this results in the unhappy state of affairs which we so constantly see around us. Persons of this class are actuated by two somewhat divergent influences, resulting in what is called Undenominationalism. Glad indeed we are to know that the numbers are daily increasing (especially since the Church has begun to make its influence more felt) of those who see very clearly the illogical and demoralising effect of Dissent upon the spiritual and moral tone of the country. Consequently, a man of this class is naturally drawn more closely to the Scriptural and devotional ordinances of the Established Church, and were it not for a want of humility would no doubt become a worthy member of that body. The authority and discipline of the Establishment is irksome to him, for the Materialistic tendency of the body to which he belongs has had its effect upon his character, and he cannot brook the dignity of the clerical office, and hates their independent denunciation of sin. What is he to do? He is spiritually homeless, his own nature will not permit him to learn the lesson of humility which would fit him for being really useful, and he can no longer tolerate the bigotry and unreality of

the Nonconforming preacher. So he practically sets himself up as the pioneer of a new (?) truth, based on Evangelical doctrine, and copiously intermixed with such views as pander to his own ineffable conceit, and all this he calls Undenominationalism. We call it a contemptible form of Dissent. Take away his personal interests, and you have deprived him of his *raison d'être*. The essence, as far as we can see, of all the principles which these men profess is simply "self" and "self-interests." This may seem rather a sweeping assertion, but the more thinking and unprejudiced men are brought into contact with such religious organisations as profess to be Undenominational the more do they see the evil that they are bringing about, and the danger which they present to true religion and order. In conclusion, we warn our readers to definitely withstand the plausible applications for help which are so largely made by so-called unsectarian bodies.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

SIR,—Circumstances must be allowed to justify ways which, for the moment, may seem erratic. I had an object in writing the sentence, "God cannot forgive sins." I know the language is not Scriptural. The truth is, and that is the main point.

God forgives sinners. He punishes sin—all sin I wished to emphasise this point. It is too much overlooked. When sinners are forgiven, it is because God "hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all."

"B." will forgive me when I say that I do not think that "He might have chosen another method." God's ways are the best. His wisdom is infinite. Another way, if it had been possible, would not have been the best. I quite agree with him when he says that ours is not to criticise what God hath done.

We ought certainly not to look on the Atonement as a "contrivance," but as part of a great plan or scheme of salvation. If the Atonement were not absolutely necessary, then was it a great waste of strength. Of this we have no other example in all God's universe. Besides, it is not likely that He who said, "Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost," would permit anything of the kind.

I do not think—and "B." will kindly forgive my saying so—that anyone properly holding that "Christ was delivered for our offences," would allow the doctrine to be "obscured," that "He rose again for our justification." They are parts of a whole.

I think "B." misses the point with respect to the anecdote. The boy is much too virtuous (?) to think that he needs any forgiveness from any but the bird. The bird cannot forgive, and so he will bear the blame for ever. This is the point: "And am I not, in consequence, far holier than a God who would forgive my sin?" Perhaps I did not make this sufficiently clear.

We cannot tell what would be David's feelings on

the arousing by the prophet of his conscience. It is more than probable that he felt the heinousness of his sin in all its bearings. I am inclined to think his acts would be hateful, because they were sinful. And this first. God's laws give the knowledge of sin. It seems to me that this would be the order of things. The cases, however, are not parallel.

I am sorry "B." does not think my letters fair. Perhaps this arises from the fact that in my sermons I am more persuasive than combative. I should, however, like to deal fairly, and so, I suppose, if I fail, it must be owing to my inability. I think that these discussions cannot but result in much good. Fairness will, of course, make them still more conducive.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, November 16th, 1889.

PARTY EXPLANATIONS OF THE CATECHISM.

SIR,—There is an outcry of this kind made here in Ireland, and doubtless with you also in England. Some object to the Church Catechism as an obscure publication. If one tries to give its undoubted meaning, it is said that we are twisting its language to Party purposes. The Catechism on Sacraments is so plain in its utterances, that anyone who objects must either mean that no explanation is to be given at all, or else that there is some other meaning, of equal, if not greater, plausibility than ours. Let us take the table-book for an illustration for the science of arithmetic. Suppose a question, "How much are two and two?" and the answer, "Four." If any objects to this as a Party explanation, we reply: "Is it impossible to say how much two and two are? or have you any other answer to give?" At the Synod a learned divine attacked the answers given in the explanation put forth by the Religious Education Board for the United Dioceses of Dublin, etc., 1889. He was supported by a learned judge, who objected generally to Party explanations. Now, of course a legal dignitary has much weight, but it should be only in his own province of learning. (Eccles. xviii. 35.) Otherwise, he stands like anyone else. Suppose a lawyer were to give a novel explanation to the term "tenant," and his new idea was to be backed up by a bishop, what weight would this backing up have with the twelve judges? None, except what it had by its intrinsic value. A bishop's authority in law ranks with a judge's in divinity.

But now let us look at the explanation given to the first answer on Sacraments in the Church Catechism. Query 1.—Meaning of Sacrament? Answer.—A sacred sign or pledge. Query 2.—In the answer, "I mean an outward sign," etc., what is said to be "given unto us"? Answer.—The inward spiritual grace. Query 3.—What is said to be ordained? Answer.—The outward sign. Query 4.—For what purpose is the outward sign ordained? Answer.—As a means of receiving the grace, and a pledge to assure us that we receive it. Query 5.—"We receive the same"; the same what? Answer.—Inward grace. I here stop. It would be tedious to go on with the questions and answers given. They are to be read in the tract I have referred to. All I ask of the objectors is to give us their own answers to the queries. We can then see which answers are the most reasonable. If they

will give none, but only object, we ask them, Have the words no meaning? Were King James' eight bishops and six deans, including Whitgift and Bancroft (see Cardwell, p. 137), incapable of drawing up an answer with a definite meaning? If no explanation of plain words *can* be given, then the children might as well learn it in Latin, as Romanists do the *Pater Noster*, *Credo*, and *Ave Maria*. If the words have any definite meaning other than words, let it be given, and then the world can judge. If our opponents will not explain themselves, nor allow our version, then we fall back on, "Let the children learn it in Latin."

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,

Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—The questions and answers which I have given above were positively objected to by the divine and the judge, and the Synod agreed to condemn them.

SHORT SERMONS.

SIR,—Some interesting letters in defence of short sermons have lately appeared in *The Times*. My own experience, as a preacher, for more than thirty years, has taught me that a very brief sermon—say, less than twenty minutes in length—is regarded with little respect. Whenever I have brought my sermon to a conclusion at the end of a quarter of an hour I have been sure to be reminded of it. The fact is, that very many church-goers consider that they are defrauded of their rights by a too brief discourse; they draw the conclusion that the preacher is not enamoured of his work, and is in a hurry to get it over and done. They draw the like conclusion from a gabbled service; they say "the man is obliged to do it, but he does not like it, so he gets through it as fast he can."

In my young days people certainly preferred what would now be called "long sermons," viz.: about thirty or forty minutes in length. I can recall the patient attention paid to such preachers as Henry Melville, Daniel Moore, and Thomas Dale, who were never short. But, at that time, preachers were valued for the amount of *instruction* they gave, and not merely for excitement's sake. It seems to me a very low type of religion which requires to be stimulated by a smart and shallow but *rousing* discourse once a week. True religion is not merely emotional, but is of little value unless built upon knowledge, meditation and reflection. I can listen with pleasure to the tamest preacher if he has really *anything* to say which will throw light upon the word of truth.

CAPELLANUS.

P.S.—An aged layman to whom I have shown this letter confirms my view of the case, and asserts that the ordinary church-goer cares only for *manner* in preaching, and not for *matter*. The sincere worshipper thinks chiefly about *what* is preached; the formalist only about *how* it is preached.

MR. E. J. POYNTER, R.A., writes to the *Times* drawing attention to the lamentable condition of Selby Minster, which he says is in such a deplorable state, from chronic want of funds to keep it in repair, that, unless immediate steps are taken to prop it up, it must simply collapse and fall together in a heap of ruins. After pointing out that Selby is a small town,

and its resources, in spite of the liberality of its leading inhabitants quite unequal to so great an expense, Mr. Poynter says there is no fear that the "vandalisms" of St. Albans will be repeated at Selby. "Almost all that remains, though in many parts much injured, is absolutely genuine work of the best kind, and there is yet time to save it from destruction, if only money is forthcoming." The Rev. A. J. Tweedie, the vicar, in a subsequent letter to the *Times*, points out that Selby can also claim to be of historical interest, for within the walls of the monastery was born the fourth and youngest son of William the Conqueror, afterwards Henry I., giving as his authority Camden, followed by Speed and Fuller.

THE Bishop of Winchester has addressed a second letter to the Rev. W. Odum, vicar of Heeley, Sheffield, with regard to his attitude towards Nonconformists:—"Most assuredly I never dreamed of coupling Dis-senters, Mahomedans, and Buddhists together. If an Englishman were to say, 'Not only do I not hate and despise Frenchmen and Germans, but I do not even despise Kaffirs and Hottentots,' it would not follow that he would put Europeans and savages in the same category; or if he were to teach his child not only not to hurt his brothers and sisters, but not also to torment dogs and cats, he would not therefore treat his own children as dogs. It is also absolutely untrue that I speak of the organisation of the English Church as the one Church of Christ, the one body of Christ, and that it is impossible to constitute a Church outside this organisation, and that all other bodies are sects humanly constituted, or, as he hints (where, when, and how?), 'mere schools of philosophy.' All this is simply wresting human language to the destruction of its true significance. I may very probably have claimed for an Episcopal constitution strong evidence from Scripture, and the irrefragable evidence of the fact, that within half a century from the death of the last Apostle there was not a Church in universal Christendom that was not governed by Bishops. I may have had to this that a Church is a Divine institution, not a human one. But I have never said more than has been said by the most moderate divines of the Anglican communion—viz., that episcopacy is apparently Scriptural and certainly Apostolical, and that though it may not be essential to the constitution of a Church, it is necessary to the completeness and perfection of Church organisation. The assertion that I am a high sacerdotalist is absolutely untrue. I am quite as much an Evangelical as I am a High Churchman, and I believe that sound Churchmanship and true Evangelicalism are perfectly tenable not only in one and the same Church, but in one and the same mind. I can find no party name by which I can call myself."

A SUCCESSFUL meeting was held on Wednesday, the 13th inst., in the large lecture-room of All Souls' College, Oxford, in support of the newly consecrated Bishop of Corea. Sir William Anson, Warden, took the chair, and in introducing the Bishop, who is a member of All Souls', to the meeting, observed that the Bishop had passed more than twenty years of his life as a servant of the Queen, as chaplain in the Royal Navy. How highly his services were appreciated in the profession he had chosen might be gathered from the facts—(1) When, in 1881, he had for a short time retired from the service in order to carry on Mission work in China, in conjunction with Bishop Scott, at the end of that time his name was replaced on the list

of navy chaplains by special Order in Council, nor could it have been done by any authority less than such an order; and (2), when the Bishop was already designated Bishop of Corea, and had appealed for men to help him in carrying on his new work, the appeal was answered first of all by blue-jackets and marines to whom he had previously ministered as chaplain. The Bishop began by explaining he had no personal knowledge of the country to which he was now being sent, but could sufficiently indicate its general character to the audience from the account of Mr. Carlin, on whose observation and judgment he knew by personal acquaintance with him that he could implicitly rely. The area of the country is about equal in extent to that of Great Britain. Its eastern or outer coast is rocky and iron-bound; its inner or western coasts is in great part a mud deposit, through which the rivers cut their way to the sea. The interior is mountainous and rises to a considerable height. The people are unenterprising. They deprecated snow-shoes as an invention which would enable them to work in the winter; they are listless and poor workmen. Their good side is that they are sociable, and both men and women naturally modest. They live in huts so low that you have to crawl into them; these have no furniture, so that you have to take your dinner off the floor. They have no form of religious faith except a somewhat debased kind of worship of ancestors. Those who are educated are educated in the classical language of China. The work must for the three first years mainly consist of learning the language and making translations into the language. To assist him in his work, the Bishop pleaded eloquently for some competent young Oxford scholars to join him. He also wants a doctor, who might start work among the natives at once, and so pave the way for the reception by them of further teaching in the future.

ON the same day, Sir J. Stainer, professor of music, gave his inaugural lecture, taking as his subject the present condition of English music. He said that the predominance of foreign music which had come in with the Hanoverian kings, to which the genius of Handel had also contributed, had, in his view, been mainly instrumental in bringing about the decay of national English music. Italian opera had for a century and a-half practically ousted English opera; in our day there were signs of revival of a national opera, and Sir A. Sullivan, if only he would turn his genius in that direction, might be the means of creating a new national English opera. Only if English opera is to flourish it must not be entirely left to private enterprise, to such ventures, for instance, as the Carl Rosa Company, but must receive, as the National Gallery does, some subvention from the State. In Church music England had always held its own, and foreign critics often expressed themselves surprised by the variety and excellence of our services and anthems. One difficulty against which our English composers had to contend was the extremely small space into which their compositions had to be compressed; this gave little scope for thematic development, whether in services or in anthems. There was a reaction taking place both in England and on the Continent against the pictorial and sensational music which had invaded our churches and in favour of a simpler and severer style, but while in Roman Catholic churches they were beginning to discard the use of female voices in services, in England

there was rather a movement the other way. The Professor himself did not see any objection to this movement, provided women were introduced into choirs in a reverent and orderly way. He did not himself consider that a woman's voice was ever equal for the singing of devotional music to a trained boy's voice, but, unfortunately, in a country parish trained boys' voices could not be obtained. Their places here might well be taken by women's voices. Our concert music has, the Professor testified, greatly improved 'only he deprecated the "unwillingness shown" by English audiences to listen to any but known favourites and "stars." This habit was fatal to the development of local talent, and made a musical career in England needlessly difficult. We have now, the Professor assures us, an excellent system of musical education in England. The vast majority of our children are taught to sing "sweetly" in our national schools, and a fair proportion of them learn to sing by note. At the other end of the scale the Royal College of Music and the Royal Academy furnish an admirable training to the students who frequent them. We should not rest, however, content till every large city at least has its own excellent choral society, its own native orchestra, and, perhaps, its own opera.

THE Bishop of Marlborough presided over a meeting held on the 14th inst. at the Church-house, Westminster, in connection with the Church of England Burial Reform Association. The usual resolutions were passed, and the Bishop, in reply to a vote of thanks, said that his acceptance of the duty of president that day was not to be taken as implying entire agreement with all the views expressed on the occasion.

AT the Carlisle Consistory Court on the 13th inst., a faculty was granted to erect two stained-glass windows in St. Mary's Church, Ambleside, in memory of the late Mr. W. E. Forster and Mr. Matthew Arnold.

THE Secretary of the Church Association has addressed a rejoinder to the Dean of Canterbury. He says:—"We never did gather a 'vast central fund for the promotion of middle-class education.' A separate society, originating with our conference at Willis's-rooms, and with Mr. Robert Hanbury for chairman, undertook the task, as you will find recorded in our *Monthly Intelligencer* for 1869. Again, Mr. Sydney Gedge did not 'found' either Wycliffe or Ridley Hall. On the contrary, more money and more subscribers to the founding of those two institutions came from the members of the Church Association than from any other quarter. The principle involved in your contention that the present 'failure to abate one ritual excess' is due to ritual prosecutions might prove a thorn in the clerical side. It is as though Welsh Dissenters attributed their refusal to pay tithe to the institution of suits for its recovery. Had the Welsh magistrates conspired to refuse summonses, and declined to assist in any way the maintenance or enforcement of the law as laid down by the Queen's Judges, while popular demagogues stumped the country to stir up ill-feeling against the Queen's courts, what would the Dean of Canterbury think of the wisdom of a diagnosis which affected to regard the sole cause of lawlessness as consisting in the aggrieved persons combining into an association to claim their legal rights before a lawful tribunal?"

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Baxter, Rev. Charles Parkhurst, M.A., Chaplain of the Central London Sick Asylum, and Assistant-Chaplain Thames Church Mission; Chaplain of the Lambeth Schools, Norwood.
 Bell, Rev. Edward John, M.A., Rector of Alderley, Cheshire, and Rural Dean of Macclesfield; Honorary Canon in Chester Cathedral.
 Bullen, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Southam, Rugby; Incumbent of St. Mary's, Bootle.
 Cudmore, Rev. R. P., Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Greenham, Newbury.
 Edmonson, Rev. William, Curate-in-Charge of Farnworth, near Widnes; Vicar of St. Peter's, Parr, St. Helens.
 Edwards, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's; Senior Vicar of Bangor Cathedral.
 Green, Rev. Frederic Philip, B.A., Rector of Pusey, Berks.
 Headley, Rev. A. A., Vicar of Porchester; Rector of New Alresford, Hants.
 Hessey, Rev. R. F., M.A., Vicar of Up Nately; Rural Dean of Odiham.
 Jenkins, Rev. Llewelyn, Curate of Newbold-on-Avon, Rugby; Rector of Penderin, Breckonsshire.
 M'Lean, Rev. T. B., Vicar of Skelmersdale; Vicar of Evenwood, Darlington.
 Neep, Rev. E. F., M.A., Incumbent of St. Mary's, Bootle; Rector of Southam, Rugby.
 Newnham, Rev. W. O., M.A., Rector of New Alresford; Rector of Western Patrick, Hants.
 Podmore, Rev. J. B., Vicar of St. Michael's, Hackney; Vicar of Cowfold, Sussex.
 St. John Mildmay, Rev. Carew H., M.A.; Rector of St. Mary's, Stamford.
 Scragg, Rev. W., Vicar of Evenwood; Vicar of Skelmersdale, Ormskirk.
 Sidgwick, Rev. J. B., M.A., Rector of Wainfleet, Boston.
 Stockdale, Rev. Edgar, Vicar of St. David's, Wettenhall, Winsford.
 Tatham, Rev. Ralph Raisbeck, M.A., Vicar of Dallington; Prebendary in Chichester Cathedral.
 Vane, Rev. G. H. F., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Missioner in the parish of St. George's, Camberwell.
 Williams, Rev. Robert, B.A., Curate of Dowlais; to the District Chapelry of St. Margaret's, Aberaman (created by an Order in Council dated the 10th day of August, 1888).
 Wylie, Rev. W. J., Vicar of Horkstow; Rural Dean of Yarrowburgh, No. 1.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Bramhall, Rev. John, sometime Vicar of Terrington St. John's, at Eastbourne, on the 15th inst., aged 79.
 Bramston, Very Rev. John, sometime Dean of Winchester, at Witham Close, Winchester, on the 13th inst., aged 87.
 Briscoe, Rev. John George, Rector of Outwell, Norfolk, at Lynwode Rectory, Lincolnshire, on the 16th inst., aged 70.
 Cust, Rev. Daniel Mitford, late Vicar of Ripley, Derbyshire, at Bangor, on the 16th inst., aged 68.
 De Grey, Hon. and Rev. Arnold, Rector of Copdock and Vicar of Washbrook, Ipswich, at Hyères, on the 15th inst., aged 33.
 Gerahty, Rev. James, M.A., formerly Rector of the parish of Donaghendry, diocese of Armagh, at Lodge Park, Kingstown, county Dublin, on the 11th inst., aged 77.
 Gott, Alexander, Senior Curate of the parish church, Tamworth, at Scarborough, on the 9th inst., aged 29.
 Hatch, Rev. Edwin, M.A., Hon. D.D. (Edin.), at Marchfield, Oxford, on the 10th inst.
 Hudson, Rev. Thomas Dawson, of Frogmore Hall, Herts, at Upper Norwood, on the 16th inst., aged 85.
 Maxwell, Rev. Charles, Rector of the parish for fifty-three years, at Wyddial Rectory, on the 14th inst., aged 78.
 Paramore, Rev. John Huxtable, M.A., twenty-three years Rector of the parish, at Dunterton Rectory, Tavistock, on the 15th inst., aged 67.
 Potts, Alexander William, LL.D., Head Master of Fettes College, at the Lodge, Fettes College, Edinburgh, on the 15th inst.
 Rooke, Rev. Thomas, at Feckenham Vicarage, on the 11th inst., aged 64.



The Church of England Pulpit.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

BY THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE WAKEFIELD CHURCH CONGRESS.

"And the seventh angel sounded, and then followed great voices in heaven, and they said, The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever."—REV. xi. 15.

THIS vision of St. John in Patmos pictures to the imagination what has been in all ages the ardent desire and hope of Christian hearts. Through the long centuries of the Church's history this prediction of future triumph has cheered despondency and animated flagging energies afresh. All these long years, while the cause of their Lord and King has, with varying fortune, continued to maintain its struggle with the powers of earth and of hell, Christian men have steadied their doubting, wavering hearts with the certainty of the promise.

No one can read with attention the story of the Gospels without perceiving that our blessed Lord had set before Him a distinct conception of the end towards which the society which He was about to found would necessarily move. Let it be, if you will, with merely historical interests that the study of the Gospels is undertaken, and the result is that we find that this young Galilean carpenter, this Jesus of Nazareth, had formed the conception of a kingdom that was about to be established, of a kingdom that was to be universal in its extent, and minute, exhaustive, exacting in its control.

In modern times it has been more common for those who have attempted to describe the rise of Christianity to think of its Founder chiefly as a Great Teacher, a Teacher of a higher and more spiritual morality, as the originator of a new religious school. And this conception of Christ as a Great Teacher is indeed abundantly warranted by the original records of our faith; but I would observe that it holds in the Gospels an entirely subordinate place. The thought most constantly present to the mind of Jesus Himself with regard to His work upon earth was—that he was the Founder, not of a new doctrine, not of a new philosophy of life, not of a school, but of a kingdom. For how are the facts made known to us? It came to pass, we are told, in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar that this startling announcement is made throughout the villages of Galilee in Pales-

tine—"the kingdom of God is at hand." This is the first public utterance of Jesus of Nazareth. It sounds like a herald's proclamation of a royal edict. "The kingdom of God is come unto you." The Gospel—"the good news"—is designated by the singular phrase, the "good news of the kingdom." His messengers into whatever city they were sent are told to make this same announcement—"The kingdom of God has come nigh unto you." The thought emerges in the most unlikely conjunctures. Utterances suited to men of timid hearts and humble lives are strangely dashed with the sudden splendour of regal associations. "Fear not little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven."

At the outset of the public career of Jesus Christ from what is represented in the story of the temptations as the last and culminating struggle, the struggle involved in the offer to Him of "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them," we may learn that the earliest biographers of Jesus supposed and assumed His desire for dominion—a desire, in its kind, perhaps as strong as the craving for food after the forty days of fasting. The account that came to them was in accord with what they knew of His character. Thus was it at the opening of the Lord's public ministry—and it was not different at its close.

With the prevalence of the Hebrew expectations of a temporal kingdom at Jerusalem it was perhaps inevitable that our Lord should at the time lay stress rather on the inward than on the outward aspect of His kingly power. But there may be detected the consciousness that the inward power was destined to assert itself eventually as a power modifying, controlling, and finally dominating all temporal power.

It was no playing with metaphor on an occasion that demanded plain and outspoken language, when in answer to the formal judicial interrogation of the Roman Governor, "Art Thou a King, then?" Jesus gave His solemn assent. To this end was He born, to this end came He into the world to bear witness to the truth, and could He now belie the truth? His kingdom was not "from this world." In origin it was of heaven, but He could not say that His kingdom was not destined to rule over the nations of the earth. They little understand the character of Jesus of Nazareth as pictured in the Gospels who can inquire why Jesus did not say plainly—"I am not a King, I am only a Teacher of religious truth. This talk about a kingdom is a mere trope, a mere figure of rhetoric." They little understand His character who do not see that the thought of a universal kingdom was dominant in the consciousness of His human soul. To Him the crown of thorns was the anticipation of the imperial diadem; to Him the reed in His right hand the iron sceptre

with which He would smite kings in the day of His power.

It seems impossible to consider what the religion of Christ really is, without perceiving that in proportion to the nearness of its approach towards its ideal will be the extent and the depths of its influence on society—on the institutions, the customs, the laws, the civil politics, and civil organisations of the world—in a word, on social and national life. The religion of Christ was in its nature, as a spiritual religion, permeating and penetrative; no province of human conduct could exempt itself from the claim of its authority. Again, nothing is more certain than that the Founder of Christianity had in view its diffusiveness, and aimed at its universality. And in these two characteristics, its inwards penetrativeness and its outward diffusiveness, lies the pledge of its ultimate triumph. The prerogative of Christianity is to bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. The commonest action of daily life was to be done as in His view—"as seeing Him Who is invisible;" whether men eat or drink or whatever they do, all is to be done to the glory of God; whatever was done in word or deed, all was to be done in the name of the Lord Jesus. The mutual relations of masters and servants, of husbands and wives, of parents and children, of rulers and subjects, all came within its cognisance, were all referred to the standard of God's will. It is obvious that, in proportion as the reference of men's actions to this exalted standard is actually made, so will the influence of Christianity upon its members, and both directly and indirectly upon social life at large, be greater or less.

To any one who believes that God made man, that man is God's work, it follows that society is God's work. If human society took its rise inevitably from the original and inherent social tendencies of human nature, then it is certain that God is the author of society. The study of a solitary unit of the human species can show us but imperfectly what man is. The relations of husband and wife, of parent and child, plainly call out some of the most powerful of the latent tendencies of human nature; but the formation of a circle wider than that of the family was not less certainly planned in the Divine design, was not less certainly an outcome of natural evolution.

We are bound to recognise to the full the great moral results of social evolution—of civilisation viewed apart from Christianity. There has been by some writers, who assume to defend our faith, a failure to recognise, perhaps an unwillingness to recognise, the good that existed in pre-Christian civilisation. But civilisation itself is God's gift. Social life from its humblest rudiments, the gradual development and organisation of civil polity, the administration of law, the practice of trade and commerce, the innumerable relations of man to man in the ordered life of a community—all these

combine to form a moral discipline of a high order. It is the province of Christianity not to destroy what is of Nature, but to raise it to the higher plane of Grace. As Christianity lays hold upon the natural though unregulated relations of the sexes, and elevates them to the supernatural and sacramental dignity of marriage, so the kingdom of the world is not meant to be destroyed by Christianity, but elevated. It will be purified, it will be ennobled. The kingdom of the world will become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

It is from the inner working of the transforming spirit of Christianity, and not from attempts at hasty and radical reconstruction from without, that we must look for the alleviation of the wrongs and hardships of our disordered days. It will do great things for us; and of this we have the pledge in that it has done great things for us already, whereof we rejoice.

Let us consider, for example, the aspect in which Christianity regards civil government. According to the Christian principle civil government is of God. In each country civil government, no matter what its form, if it fulfils the essential functions of government, demands the allegiance of the Christian. Some forms of government may fall in better than others with the expansive energy of our faith; but as man himself possesses a wonderful power of physical adaptation to varying climates and surroundings, so the religion of the Son of Man can adapt itself to the most various social and political conditions. It can not only live, but it can exercise a most powerful influence upon the lives of men living under the most diverse forms of civil polity. The Church of Christ has co-existed with the imperial rule of the Cæsars, and with the wild sway of the barbarian tribes that overwhelmed that rule—with arbitrary personal government such as was to be found in Russia, and with the democracy of the United States of America. We are to honour, we are to obey the King as supreme, and the governor as sent by him. But the Apostle bases that obedience upon rational grounds. The magistrate is the minister of God to thee for good. He is sent for the punishment of evildoers and the praise of them that do well. He must not bear the sword in vain. He is to be honoured because he bears not the sword in vain. And hence, when government ceases to fulfil the causes of its being, it ceases to have a just claim upon the allegiance of the subject; because it is in reality no longer government, but only anarchy in disguise.

It is in giving practical effect to this principle of the rational basis of authority that the Christian religion has from time to time presented itself in history in two aspects, which to the superficial observer may seem contradictory in their tendencies—first, as sustaining the stability of settled institutions; and, secondly, as assailing the unrighteous exercise of power.

It has come to be generally admitted, even by

historians not ordinarily over-indulgent to Christianity (more especially to that form of Christianity universally prevalent in the mediæval period), that among the reckless princes and turbulent nobles of the innumerable petty States into which Europe was then divided, among the violent and lawless who were constantly engaged in wars of plunder or of private feud, the existence of an acknowledged spiritual authority, exerted mainly in powerful opposition to tyranny and injustice, was an influence highly beneficial to the general interests of the community. It was a protest on behalf of the unseen things of truth and righteousness against the eager greed of the world of flesh and blood.

To possess power and-to be irresponsible for its exercise is a condition dangerous to the clearness and force of moral perceptions. It is so even in the case of men of cultivated intelligence; much more in the case of rude men of strong passions and undisciplined wills. Then it was that the Church in innumerable instances warned or again rebuked the great ones of the earth; then it was that she again and again raised her voice with all the august authority of her Founder and Head, and to monarchs and princes of the world feared not to utter the prohibition, "Thou shalt not." The courageous repulse of the Emperor Theodosius by Ambrose of Milan was only one of the earliest of a long line of similar protests against the cruelty and injustice of irresponsible power. There is, indeed, no country whose history cannot furnish instances of the same righteous boldness. Nor is it to be imagined that in our own day has ceased the Church's office of rebuking tyranny, its office of awakening conscience and reinforcing its appeals. It may be that the danger to civilisation no longer proceeds from the violence and lawless greed of princes and nobles. But it is absurd to fancy that the need of Christian courage and wisdom in proclaiming the truth and 'speaking in behalf of righteousness does not still remain. Another king has come to rule over us. King Mob has been crowned and has begun his reign. He is in reality not less selfish, not less grasping, than his predecessors in power; with little foresight and very ignorant; readily moved by sudden and ill-considered impulses; strongly resenting opposition, and capable at times of practising great cruelty and great injustice. And he is eager to be told that he is truly wise and good, and is as prompt to swallow flattery as any who ever occupied a royal palace. It is with this unruly and turbulent potentate that the Church is now brought face to face.

If society is to be saved, it is the religion of Christ that alone can save it. The very foundation principles upon which society is built are being tampered with. The moral law of God is being dealt with in a spirit of deceitful casuistry that saps its strength. If the principles of morals that lie at the basis of civil society, and are essential to its

maintenance and well-being, are to secure a hold upon the masses of the people, or indeed a hold upon any who are strongly tempted to violate them, they need the support, the vital force, and energy imparted to them by religion. The power of the emotional and spiritual nature of man must be allied with the sense of duty, if the sense of duty is to be practically efficacious. Does the course of history lead us, do you think, to believe that human nature can afford, in the strength of its native virtue, to dispense with such aids to well-doing as are supplied by the feelings of an exalted love, of religious fear, reverence, and awe? It will not suffice for society that the Tables of the Law should be deposited in dignified seclusion within the golden walls of the ark. They must be deciphered and proclaimed in men's hearing, accompanied by the dread sanctions of the supernatural world. Their principles must be inwoven in the texture of youthful education.

My brethren of the clergy will know how often objections have been raised by liturgical scholars to the recitation of the Ten Commandments day after day in the Eucharist service of the Anglican communion. It is not my wish to consider here the exact appropriateness of the place they occupy, but sure I am that it is no small thing for any nation that the great fundamental principles of the moral law should be publicly and solemnly enunciated, repeated, and repeated again, in the hearing of the people. Is not the family the unit out of which society is built up? And can we trust to modern civilisation, and to the results of what men call "culture," as securities for the maintenance intact of the family life? While sins of the flesh are still lightly regarded in society; while shameful — nay, shameless — profligacy runs its course even in high places; while the marriage bond is reckoned a knot that readily yields to a little management, shall we be too refined to say aloud, "God spake these words and said, Thou shalt not commit adultery." In these days of wide-spread dishonesty, of scheming adventures, of ingeniously contrived bankruptcies, of bubble companies, of commercial operations carried on upon roguish principles, and sometimes involving in terrible ruin the happiness of thousands of innocent persons; in these days, when even governments are tempted to silence popular clamour, and secure a temporary triumph by tampering with the rights of property, by evacuating the force of solemn contracts, by confiscating what belongs to one man in order to satisfy another man's greed; in these days it is not for the Church to lower her voice as she proclaims, "God spake these words and said— Thou shalt not steal." Nay, my brethren, even the sanctity that attaches to God's gift of life to man has surely been made light of in our day. A great and beautiful province of this United Kingdom, but a few hours distant from us, has been for some years back, with but brief intermissions, the

scene, week after week, of assassination, successfully or unsuccessfully attempted. Shocking it is to think that there are those who do not scruple to send a fellow-man to his dread account before the Great Judge, because he has chosen to exercise his legal rights or has been guilty of the crime of paying his just debts; shocking that not only in Ireland, but across the Atlantic and in the great cities of the continent of Europe there are men who will recklessly destroy innocent lives in the hope of attaining some revolutionary or socialistic success. While these things are so may the Church never cease to raise the voice of solemn proclamation, "God spake these words and said—Thou shalt do no murder."

But the proclamation of the eternal law of righteousness, though surrounded by all the sanctions of religion; cannot by itself suffice to modify largely the existing conditions of society. That can be effected only by bringing the religion of love into actual and vital contact with the sources of political and social movements—the hearts of the people of England. It is a task that had long been but partially and imperfectly understood by the Church. The rapidly increasing population of the country for awhile outstripped the Church's power; and the vastness of the task before her when it came to be apprehended for a while paralysed her energies. But she has awakened from her stupor; she has gathered together her strength, and has set vigorously about her appointed labour. Yes; the Church of England is every day proving herself more and more to be the Church of the people of England—of the people of England in all those various grades and ranks and varieties of class and of station, that rise of necessity—*i.e.*, of the will of God, in a highly organised social life. If she is true to her duty the Church of England—that is, the Church of the people of England—will ever protest against and denounce the wild and wicked talk that would stir up division, and set class against class, and the masses against the classes. She, who is the mother of us all, out of her great heart bestows her fostering care on all alike, on the noble and on the peasant, on the educated and on the ignorant, on the wealthy and on the indigent. Nay, even that multitude, which when viewed as a wayward and unreasoning crowd we call the "mob," she recognises as a multitude of her children, our brethren in Christ, men and women for whom Christ died. They are to be reached, she knows, as men and women, all the world over, have been reached—by the personal touch of love. If Christianity were but a philosophy of enlightened ethics, and if the ministers of religion were but the teachers and preachers of that philosophy, I should indeed despair. But the Church has a living, loving heart that will not rest content till she goes down among the people, lays hold of them, and draws them to herself. She is ready to prove her earnestness by herself sharing in the disadvan-

tageous circumstances of the poor, and will use both brain and hand to mitigate the evils from which they suffer. Nor is her message and guidance for one class only, but for all. She declares that the possession of wealth and the possession of influence, however acquired, are stewardships for which men are accountable. She repeats, she emphasises, the admonition, not less needed to-day than when it was first pronounced, "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be ready to distribute"—ah more, much more, than this—"ready to sympathise." (See 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, R.V.) She is not indifferent to the teaching of economic science, though she holds that the accumulation and diffusion of wealth do not suggest the problems of deepest interest to the national life. She warns against lives wasted in the pursuit of mere personal and selfish gratification. She has to declare to all that their true happiness cannot co-exist with disregard for the happiness of others. She has by word and by deed, by constant iteration, and by practical effort, to make men feel and know that God hath tempered the body together that there should be no division, but that the members should have the same care one for another, that the eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of thee;" nor again, the head to the feet, "I have no need of you." And so with the love which her own love calls forth she will bridge the chasms that are now separating class from class. Such is the task that lies before the Church. It is a mighty task, and such as might well daunt the boldest spirit, but the Church undertakes it in the name of Him in Whom is centred all power and authority; and He will not fail her in this hour of need. "If God be for us who can be against us?"

THE SOUL AND ITS VALUE.

BY THE REV. PHILIP DWYER, M.A., ENGLISH CHAPLAIN.

SERMON PREACHED AT NEUCHATEL ON THE 2ND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER, 1889.

"For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or, what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—MATTHEW xvi. 26.

WHEN "Peter rebuked Jesus" for saying that "He must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things," Peter having been first stigmatised as "Satan" for this opinion, "then said Jesus unto His disciples, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." In the next words of the 25th verse, He gives the reason for all this—a reason which embraces two opposite alternatives, the one positive, the other privative. "For, whosoever will save his life, shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for My sake, shall find it." Then comes the text. This, instead of the

usual form of authoritative proclamation, "Verily, verily, I say unto you," is put into the form of an interrogation. And, accordingly, the Lord and Saviour leaves it to His disciples to reply "out of their own mouths," and each one for himself is to decide here as in a matter of obvious self-interest, although one involving besides a great deal more, and especially in the ways of loving service and of simple loyalty. This concernment of each one in his own soul is shadowed forth under two perfectly separate conditions, which are designated, the one "profit and loss," and the other "exchange," or equivalent values proffered.

In the words following the text the Lord resumes the didactic mode, indeed takes up the prophetic, and drawing aside the curtain of time and sense, discloses a crowning consideration of enforcement by letting in the light of his second coming to illuminate the situation, and impart to it an indescribable element of awe and of honour. "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then shall He reward every man according to his works." A few considerations are now to be submitted to you for the elucidation of this duty, founded, as it is, upon the supreme value to each one of "his own soul." And while pressing these, as directed against a godless profession and a gross life of sensual indulgence or indifference, we are no less aware of the opposite danger arising from a morbid fanaticism and an ascetic pride, being cultivated as if it was a very high religion.

First, then, learn we the value of these souls of ours from the creation of the soul. The soul was the master-piece of God, the crowning work of His creative power. It was made after a solemn conclave of "The Three in One." It was made "in the image and likeness of God" Himself. With it man was made to be the High Priest of creation, the most noble of the newly-fashioned, and the golden link between earth and heaven.

Mark well also how all else that was created is described in Genesis. This is but the erected stage, the pictorial lesson-book of man, the mirror of God's goodness for the gladdening and for the training of the soul of man. Thus further, the very form and scope of the divine record seem to remind one of the relative value "of everything that was created and made," just as in some grand painting with land and water, trees and beasts, fruit and flowers, the glorious arch of blue, the sun coming forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, the tiny myriads of insect life exulting in his gladdening rays. But all these, from the greatest to the least, are only guiding lines, subordinated in a perfectly true perspective, so that the eye and the mind may be led up to, and may rest upon, the central figure commanding the foreground. And this figure is man with an immortal soul—the companion and associate of the Lord God, his Father and his Friend.

Secondly.—If we may measure values by the contentions which take place over them, how awfully precious the soul appears when becoming the prize contended for between the supreme powers of good and of evil. What, then, is this whole world for, and for what are life and time too, but to unfold the destiny of the soul upon the most awful of battle-fields and in the grandest drama ever put upon the stage of affairs and enacted—the drama of "The Kingdom of Heaven."

Thirdly.—See you not the value of the soul in the dread and sad results of its fall. Shame follows fast upon sin. Guilt suffuses the blush of shame. Death ensues. Moral death at once in the defilement of the soul, and physical dissolution in the return of the body ere long to the dust of the earth whence it came. All around, ah! what a changed scene, even in the very "garden of the Lord." Thorns and thistles abound, sighs and moans swell on the angry gusts. "Blood" shed by brother's hand stains the earth and "cries aloud" for an avenging hand. The sanction of the death-penalty pursues the murderer, because the blow he struck had snapped unbidden the tie binding to the body a soul created in God's image and likeness. Ere long the earth becomes filled with violence and defiled with vice. A flood must sweep away the ungodly. Fire from heaven must lick clean up the cities of the plain. The seven nations of Canaan, like many a heathen tribe nowadays to be met with, are flung out and wasted away for their multiplying iniquities and enormities. The chosen race itself is sent into captivity time after time for their idolatries and other moral corruptions. Now, for what purpose is all this recorded so exactly, unless to enforce the lesson of the preciousness of this soul of man by so terrible and oft-recurring vindications of God's broken law—a law that was instituted for its moral direction and exaltation in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness?

Fourthly.—Look at the plan of redemption, together with the mode of its revelation and development, and we learn again, each one of us, how precious is our soul. From the first promise of "the seed of the woman," from the growing clearness of the covenant struck with the patriarchs, from the symbolic teachings of Aaron and of Levi, from the republication at Sinai of the moral law that was inwrought into every man's being and written on his conscience, from the voices of the prophets and the melody of the Psalms, from the calm, simple, manly historic pages of the New Testament, from the profoundly spiritual and practical delineations and applications of the epistles; above all, from those ecstatic visions of St. John, ranging through the heights of heaven and the depths of the portentous future, until "it is finished," nay, even onward in vistas of holy beauty, bright as they are endless. Well, from all

these, what else learn we, at least of what most concerns ourselves, but the value of the soul, yes, the value of the soul, thus enlightened, thus kept, thus trained, thus triumphant, thus identified with God's moral government, thus to become sharer of his glory in his "Kingdom come."

Fifthly.—And does not Providence again teach us the value of the soul. We read the histories of the greatest nations of olden and of modern times. We admire the lights of genius, kindled of God in the greatest of men to guide these nations towards determined issues bearing upon results forecasted concerning "the Kingdom which the God of Heaven shall set up." We ponder the devious course of man's career, ordered, settled, controlled, directed nevertheless, for what? For what else but the preservation of the favoured nation, for the preparation of "the fulness of time," and for a consummation at its close pre-luding bliss untarnished and endless. And what is the intended upshot of all? A supreme conviction of the value of the soul, going deeper and deeper ever still, to sway the mighty forces of an enlightened and sobered judgment, and to renovate the fresh springs of a divinely imparted life and energy.

Sixthly.—We take the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ as the noblest proof of the Value of the Soul and an absolutely perfect ideal of its possible beauty. Who can bear to speak of "Him," in cold didactic strain, or furnish forth argumentative thinkings through the weak medium of uninspired words. For the critical application of the text, our best plan will be just to look at Him and listen to Himself. Harken then first to this, welling up through the lips of Truth from the heart of Love.

"What shall it profit a man, though he gain the whole world and lose his own soul." Many a teacher of man has used good words and taught right deeds, but failed alike in the doing and even in the very teaching. "Those same philosophers* who write treatises in condemnation of vain-glory vain-gloriously prefix their names to them." And the Pharisees "say and do not." While you listen then to these words look first at Him, whose words they are, and learn, and retain a correct and full impression of what took place, above all, when "the Devil taketh Him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and saith unto Him, all these things will I give thee and the glory of them, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." What these "kingdoms of the world and the glory of them were," the muse of Milton exalted and kindled into sublimity in one of his most gorgeous word-pictures has delineated. We take merely the dry geographical bounds of the Roman Empire at that day and find that it extended from the Parthians to the Britons, and wellnigh from the

shores of the Baltic to the sands of the Nubian deserts. But what did Jesus say to the proffer of this gigantic and glorious bribe, so seductive to "ambition, the last infirmity of noble minds," and yet so enslaving of the soul withal? We read—"Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." What is the soul worth now, ask yourselves? At least you must listen to these words of Jesus with a profound respect for Him, and you must also answer for this both here and hereafter. Again, to Him we look in guilt, to Him listen when "the iniquities of our heels compass us about;" and while such an one says (but feebly after all), "My bones waxed old through my roaring all the day, for day and night thy hand was heavy upon me, my moisture was turned into the drought of summer." In the terrors of God, hearken we to His tenderness from the lips of Jesus issuing as a well of life, clear as crystal, "Come unto Me all ye that travail and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Listen to Him again, aye, and look unto Him too, and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth." When dying on the Cross of Shame, erected upon the Hill of Calvary, as "a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world," He bowed His head saying, "It is finished," and dismissed His spirit, the last voluntary act of a love unto death. Where are we to go, what are we to say, how are we to feel, when are we about to think of our souls? There were never, outside of special divine inspiration, words written, more accordant with God's mind, or more befitting "miserable sinners" such as we are, than these words, and accordingly let them ascend from every heart and lip as wreathed incense, to be presented by the Great "High Priest" in the golden censor. "By Thine agony and bloody sweat, by Thy precious death and burial, by Thy glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, Good Lord deliver us." Oh, how precious the soul, rescued by such efforts, bought at such a price, healed by such a Physician, blessed by such a Friend, crowned with such a destiny!

Seventhly.—Glance for a moment at the character of Jesus Christ, so noble, unique, and consistent with perfection absolute, as to win the admiration of even blaspheming infidels. Oh, of how much is the soul capable, when even the body, as of Himself to overflowing, so of every believer on Him in measure, becomes "the temple of the Holy Ghost" an altar of incense, or as one of the golden harps of the sanctuary with every string attuned and resonant of praise. And further, when "our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ," who can overestimate the nobility of the soul's origin, the dignity of its education and standing, its capacity for the highest good and the noblest service, as we are fellow-workers with God, "and sharers, if we overcome, of Christ's own throne" hereafter.

* Cicero makes this remark.

And here, too, while the value of the soul appears awfully exhibited in its impressionable sensitiveness to what is evil and tenacity of evil, and the fact that "fleshly lusts war against the soul," and that evil thoughts spread like thistle down far and near, and evil habits multiply like roots of thorns overpowering the soul and choking the good seed of God's Word. On the other hand, we do well to follow the example of Christ here, and be made like unto Him, in that manly naturalness wherein He was indeed so nobly true to the humanity He condescended to take on Himself. Nothing fanatical was here, nothing ascetic, nothing "righteous over-much." He ate with publicans and sinners; He drank wine and made it too by miracle, though defamed as a wine-bibber. God and truth, love and nature, were His guides. Only from what was sinful did He abstain. This too is a noble ideal for us.

Eighthly.—Reflect upon the means of grace, that you may still better learn how precious are your souls in the sight of God. What shall we say of that volume in which you have so many communications of wisdom, and letters and breathings replete with love divine? Is not your Sonship sealed, aye, and resealed by His two Sacraments? Is not the throne of grace made accessible and inviting to you by a new and living way which He hath consecrated through the veil—that is to say, His flesh? "and have you not in the ascended Saviour a Mediator ever living to make intercession for us, also a King, yea, "the Prince of the Kings of the earth?" Is not the ministry of the Gospel devised at once to plead with you on earth in genial human nearness, and made efficacious from heaven by a divine accompaniment, and both ways to the overflowing of your soul's joy, and in the abatement of its fears and woes, as well as for your edification in ignorance and guidance in perplexities, also furthermore graciously conducive? In a word, do not "all things work together for good to them that love God, and are the called according to His purpose. Nay more, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." And attending with every means of grace that they become effectual, and in every discipline of trial to make it a blessing to your soul, the Holy Spirit of God, a swift winged gentle dove, descending chosens as His special task, nay, even His daily delight, to frame you after Christ's image, and seal you "His for ever" in your sanctified body, soul, and spirit.

Ninthly.—Is not the value of your immortal soul so great and God's love for you so far-reaching and so contagious an influence, that little as you may have ever thought of religion, and miserably as you may have disgraced your baptismal standing, and far and long, oh, how far and long and deep, down, down, as you may have sunk in shameless sin, and forgotten your Father days without numbers, if you will be turned, if but repent, if but

believe in the Lamb slain for you, "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Yes, bliss is always there, but joy only reigns when a soul is saved. How precious then must be a soul?

Tenthly.—If the value of one soul is beginning to be estimated correctly by you, what shall we say about the Church, "the general assembly of the redeemed in heaven." What is the Church? This is the "great wonder in heaven, the woman clothed with the sun, the moon under her feet, and a crown of twelve stars radiant and glittering upon her fair, pure brow." Look at her again on earth. What is she there? "The dragon stood before the woman, which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she had a place prepared for her of God." Well, learn from all this that what seems a hopeless cause, a forsaken and hapless failure, is in God's esteem and through Christ's unseen might, grander than the sun, sweeter in her gentle sheen of grace and glory imparted than the moon, and the very morning stars in their ruddy splendour are but faint shows of her magnificence, and feeble heralds even of her present glories. For this is the unified aggregate of souls redeemed.

Eleventh.—How can I omit to ask you to hearken to a voice, another voice that bears testimony to the value of the soul. It is the voice of a cry, the voice of a life-long agony, the voice of creation groaning in her birth-pangs. For what is all this? On what does it hinge, when shall it cease, nay, turn into a pæan of universal exultation? Well, this is the voice of creation, of "all creation, waiting for the adoption—to wit, the redemption of the body," when the body, soul, and spirit of everyone of Christ's members shall have their full consummation and bliss in God's eternal and everlasting glory. Yes, and more, far more than all this, shall be cleansed without a stain, and finished without a flaw into absolute perfection. These souls of the redeemed of the Lord are fitted with such capacities of blessedness, and are to be enlarged with such infinite augmentations for the reception and for the perception of glory and of beauty—far, far above aught possible through the present inlets and outlets of "sensation and of reflection," that this poor little world is all too small, all too unfinished, all too vile and stained with sin to become suitable and adapted for the high manhood to be attained by the sons of God; and, accordingly, the earth and the works that are therein shall be burnt up. There shall be a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Paradise is once more to be replenished with healing leaves and springs of streaming purity, and what Paradise saw not, there shall arise "the new Jerusalem," and better and holier, fairer, and more beauteous than what Paradise witnessed in the first nuptials of the great

Father and Mother of Adam's race; there shall be seen "the Bride, the Lamb's wife, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." But all this is exclusively for them "which are written in the Lamb's book of life." This limitation is absolute in its bearings.

Twelfth.—Only brief notice can be given to the second clause of the text—"Or, what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" To whom and to what does this refer? Read first the whole passage before and after these words in order to ascertain this with precision. It cannot refer to the man "in the 24th verse," who denies himself, takes up his cross daily, and follows Jesus. It cannot point to him either in the 25th verse—"Whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it." Not such casts about in blind agony to "give in exchange for his soul." These received this when given to them rather. Nay more, in the 27th verse, so far from this fitting into the future, the contrary prevails, for "then shall the Son of Man reward every man according to his works." But to whom else referred to in the discourse are the words befitting? As for dragging in or assuming a third sort of people, this is simply outrageous. Certainly, to the man who will not deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Jesus Christ, the words agree. Certainly, the words befit the man "whosoever will save his life shall lose it." Now examine the text itself. To make the second clause cover only and exactly the same ground as the first clause involves a mere tautology or unmeaning repetition. Again, Hebrew parallelism does not require this—rather does require some expansion, variation, or progression of the idea.* But the introduction of the word "or," a disjunctive instead of "and," a copulative particle, clearly points to, not a coincidental condition, but to a further alternative sequence. The "giving in exchange for his soul" in no way or at no time touches the man who "takes up his cross and follows Christ." And it does not also touch the other kind of man while here in life and time, because his whole and sole care then was to gain the whole world, and he was utterly reckless as to "the losing of his own soul" or not ensuing. Nay more, such an one is represented as having succeeded to perfection in this act of a moral and spiritual suicide. What then? It is not merely that there shall be, nay, there is to such an one no "profit." There shall be worse, a far worse consequence. There shall be loss sustained likewise, and this is expressed in the awful words of interrogation that convey an assurance of an absolute impossibility, for "what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" To such an one the dream of an *ex post facto* deliverance of his soul is here dispelled, "so that he must let that alone

for ever." What was given for his soul, nay, "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world," he trampled under foot. Now he is shown to have no other foothold on which to stand. "There remains no more sacrifice for sin" to such. No more the Spirit cometh to strive in such; he is thrown back upon himself and his naked resources—miserable man! And these are declared nothing worth, nay, an absolute nothing. If words spoken never die, but ring and re-echo in endless dread pulsations, then "what shall a man give in exchange for his soul," blending with "Depart from Me ye cursed," consummate an irreversible doom, because they crown an incurable badness. Before God I declare to you that I can find none other just, fair, natural, and unforced meaning in these most awful words: I keep back nothing, add nothing, confound or divide nothing, so far as I know myself; I deliver God's own full message truly. The sequence of a God-defying, Christ-forsaking, Spirit-grieving life is a spiritual bankruptcy, an absolute incapacity of blessed divine relations being cultivated, "a gulph" dug in the very soul itself, cutting off all amicable interchanges with God and His grace; and the man has to thank himself only for the digging of it, and for this cutting himself off from God's love by despising reproofs, insulting patience, and dismissing the love of a Saviour left to weep in secret places over a lost, because incorrigible, soul. Ah, "we were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived." Be such no longer—no, not for a moment more. Now is the day of salvation; now is all that you can call your own, and this is the point on which your eternal all is trembling. To God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be all praise and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

THE Rev. Arthur Robins, rector of Holy Trinity, Windsor, writes to us that the Bishop of Oxford warmly approves of his proposal to form a council or league of the Church for raising and purifying the moral life of the people by improving the condition of the homes of the poor. The Bishop writes:—"You have, I am sure, my very sincere sympathy in your project for the better housing of the poor."

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

* See Lowth and Jebb on this.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA.
COUGHS, COLDS, CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly **CURED**
 by simply using the

AMMONIAPHONE

FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.

21s. post free. WILL LAST FOR YEARS.

Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
 Corner of Rabbitts Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1889.

UNDENOMINATIONALISM—II.

ONE of the sorest points to many a clergyman and one of the greatest drawbacks to religious activity in any parish is the feeling amounting in many cases almost to animosity, between the Church and Dissent, between Churchmen and Dissenters. This is wrong, and as Christian men we must feel it, and shall eagerly welcome all efforts to bring about the union of Christendom under the wise guardianship and protection of episcopal authority; but whilst we do think that it is often the duty of the clergy of the Established Church to assume a pacific attitude towards the so-called Dissenting "clergy" we believe that any dealings of a friendly character with the Undenominationalists will but end in loss to the Church, whilst they will eventually tend to swell the ranks of the worst forms of Dissent.

The clergyman, who, from a sincere desire to deal leniently with the prejudices of others is drawn into even a tacit sympathy with the undenominational societies, is indeed much to be pitied, for ere long he will find out that the great superstructure of Dissent is being surely and firmly built up on the foundation which the prestige and influence of the Established Church afford—should we need illustration we have but to look at the work of kindred societies, to the London City Mission—from which men are sent forth to do Christ's work in an unsectarian and an undenominational way. Apart from the grave question whether it is possible to do Christ's work in any but an orderly way, and under due authority, the result of this system which we deplore so much cannot be overlooked. The city missionary in nine cases out of ten, if not

openly declared as such is in reality a Dissenter, he knows however that as such his influence would not be great, and so by a judicious profession of liberality of thought, as well as of neutrality, seeks to gain an influence with the body of Churchmen among whom he lives. He is and must be at heart an enemy to the episcopal system, but as long as it pays him he generally steers clear of too apparent a devotion to the chapels of the neighbourhood. He is, however, at all times ready in case of any friction with the clergy or Church party to link his interests with those of the Nonconformists relying on the idea that by betraying the interests of that body to which he owes almost everything, he will obtain exalted position in the dissenting community.

It is a lamentable fact that few comparatively are alive to these facts until it is too late. What we want is Church societies to help Church organisation. Are Churchmen to support the societies which are subtly undermining the foundations of the Church? We call men to awake to the responsibility of the case, that a cry of alarm may run through the country such as shall awake those who profess to belong to our body to the harm they unwittingly do by contributing to, or indeed tolerating, such dangerous associations as those known as Undenominational.

Reviews and Notices.

"CHRISTIAN UNION." A Paper by the Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A., of Manchester, and late Vicar of Penwortham. London: "Church of England Pulpit" Office. Price 2d.

THE title given to this paper by its author scarcely does justice to its scope, or characterises its purpose. It is a masterly exposure of the hindrance to Christian union which has been erected by the Bishops, in the resolution of the last Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Episcopate. Canon Rawstorne first points out that the English Church is, and has been the chief proposer of union among orthodox Christians, animated by two principal reasons—first because she occupies a central position round which the scattered fragments of separated Christianity may easily crystallise; and secondly, because she is conscious of her own weakness in having lost, as a Church, the allegiance of the greater part of the people of whom she is the spiritual mother. We have of late been so much soothed by the gentle optimism of Episcopal charges, that plain speaking like this comes to us as a wholesome tonic. We ought to face all facts fairly and calmly; and Canon Rawstorne shows it is a fact that in every part of the Empire, except in England, the Church is in a minority. In America we hear that the Episcopal body is advancing in an appreciable degree with the advance of the population, which is more than can be affirmed of any other denomination; but inasmuch as the population is advancing more rapidly than any, this report is not very reassuring. The Church has even a bare majority nowhere except in England, in Barbadoes, and in St. Helena. The Lambeth Conference in

full view of these facts put forward a resolution containing four articles as the only possible basis of Christian union, *i.e.*, 1. The Scriptures; 2. Two of the Creeds; 3. The two Sacraments; 4. The Historic Episcopate.

Canon Rawstorne then roundly accuses the Bishops of a disingenuous concealment; *i.e.*, that their own committee on the subject had made a recommendation to recognise, under certain conditions, Presbyterian Orders.

Against the suppression of this report, and against the closed doors and excluded reporters behind which the Lambeth Conference was carried on, Canon Rawstorne vigorously protests—and his protest carries with it the indignant assent of all Clergy and laity who are not in Episcopal leading-strings. He then proceeds to discuss the articles which this secret conclave thought it politic to put forward. Starting from the principle laid down by the Bishops that only the original Christianity of the New Testament can be required as a basis of union, he shows how widely they have departed from it in their resolution. Not to say that the two Creeds are documents of later centuries, and were unknown to Christ and His Apostles—a fact easily proved—he takes up the phrase “the Historic Episcopate,” and shows that it is a deliberate delusion. Tracing with brevity and clearness, the ever changing character of Church rule, from the Presbyter-Bishops of the Apostle’s time, through various modifications, down to the Diocesan Bishop of our own day, he asks how it is possible for reasonable men to demand from outsiders an obedient acceptance of our modern secular form of Episcopacy, on the ground that it is the same thing which the Apostles wrote about? Can they be serious in laying down as an essential part of the only possible polity of Christ’s Church the “monarchical episcopacy” of this 19th century, which no scholar pretends to be identical with the rule of primitive times? or in requiring a submission from men, on whose work God the Holy Ghost has set the seal of His approval, to a form of Church rule, which on its secular side is without a shadow of warrant from the New Testament?

But Mr. Rawstorne does not stop there. He points out with irresistible force that Christ Himself gave us, as the test of pretention to a Divine Mission, not a genealogy of prelates consecrated by prelates, but the simple principle “By their fruits ye shall know them.” No pretender to exclusive gifts can deny that the fruits of the spirit are not tied now, if ever they were, to a particular hierarchy. The writer urges, with much pungency, that the loss of organic unity is not an evil but a good, which should be recognised as such, and so the way cleared for intercommunion with other bodies of Christians; and thus “Archbishop Benson might possibly find himself recognised by most Protestants, not quite as *papa alterius orbis*, but at least as *primus inter pares*”; while, by attempting to revive the exclusive pretensions of Episcopacy, the Bishops are drawing down on themselves, as Rome has done, the guilt of schism. The weak point of Canon Rawstorne’s admirable paper is in the failure to specify what he means by “the vital parts of Christianity”; but he concludes with a shot between wind and water when he refers to an eminent lady, who exemplifies true Christian union, when she communicates not only in the Chapel of Windsor Castle, but in the Kirk of Crathrie, and who is higher than the Archbishop of Canterbury, being in all causes ecclesiastical and civil, within her dominions supreme

“CATECHETICAL INSTRUCTION, &c.” By Rev. William Sherrard. Seventh Edition. 13th Thousand, Revised and Enlarged. Dublin: Herbert, Grafton Street, 1889.

THIS is a most able, and, as far as it goes, most Catholic as well as Protestant supplement to the Church Catechism. It is so elaborate that it seems fitter for teachers than for children. It is strong and plain against Romish teaching as to Corporal Presence, Auricular Confession, and Papal Supremacy. Ultra Protestants objected that it condemns schism as the sin of Korah; and that it agrees that we ought not to forsake the apostles fellowship and doctrine. It seems very sound on these points, though it has yielded to clamour in expunging some things unreasonably objected to. But, if another edition comes out, we would advise the learned author to speak plainly on one or two points. We should tell teachers and pupils that in Baptism the water conveys adoption, etc., to the fit recipient including all infants; and that the bread in the Eucharist is the means of conveying what St. Paul calls the Body and Blood of Christ. Also in speaking of oblations, he should not overlook that the bread and wine have been always so regarded. But though it halts, it goes a good distance in the Catholic direction.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—The statement made in the PULPIT of the 16th inst., that *αἰών* in the singular never “means endless time,” does not agree with the Septuagint of Deut. xxxii. 40, where it is put for endless existence of God: “I live *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.” Nor is it in accordance with St. John x. 28, where it is made coeval with the felicity of the blessed: “I give unto them eternal life, and they shall not perish *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*”; nor with xii. 34, where Christ is said to “abide for ever.” Aristotle’s derivation of this word must stand till a better be produced. He is a better authority than most people.

It is now admitted that *αἰώνιος* means endless, but that this is the accommodated meaning of it. Now, supposing this to be true, there is nothing to prevent us from using it in that sense in Matthew xxv. 46. This admission, therefore, upsets their theory. The true critical principle is that it must be taken in its unlimited sense, unless there be something in the subject or context to limit it. To suppose our Lord used the same word, in the same breath, in different senses, without at the same time giving His hearers any intimation of a change of meaning, would be to represent Him falsely.

There is no text which, when fairly interpreted, lends any countenance to the notion that the punishment of the wicked will come to an end; while there are many, on the other hand, which confirm the doctrine contained in what has been called the “severe texts.” Besides, where is the *sense* of a man going to hell to get his sins either “burned” or “castigated” out of him, when he could avoid that bitter experience by coming to Christ now, who is able to save unto the *utmost* all that come unto God through Him?

Ebrard, in his commentary on Heb. xi. 1, says: "This verse does not give a *definition* of faith"; but *ἐλεγχος* "signifies *demonstration* or *actual proof*, and that faith gives the *knowledge* and *proof* of things *not seen*." The Revised Version translates *ἐλεγχος* by "proving," and in the margin by "test." Now, suppose that the marginal reading, "test," were the better rendering, as some of your correspondents maintain, then, upon their own showing, there is no radical difference between this word and *δοκιμάζω*, which they wish to be translated by "test." Again, the Revisers translate *δοκιμάζετε*, in 1 Thess. v. 21, by "prove"; and, as we have seen above, they translate *ἐλεγχος*, in Heb. xi. 1, by the same word, which is a plain proof that in *their* opinion there is no essential difference between the two words so translated.

How would you "test" the truth or falsity of a proposition if not by an argument? Dr. Adam Clarke, in his commentary, explains 1 Thess. v. 21 by: "Whatever ye hear in preachings, examine by the *words of Christ* and by the *doctrines* which we have delivered unto you." The nicety of a translation consists in selecting out of the various significations of a word the meaning which best suits the subject we are translating about. The Revisers evidently acted on this principle, because, while they put "bond-servant" in the margin, they preferred to put servant in the text. No doubt, with the facts of our Lord's life before them, they felt fully justified in doing so. We could with propriety call Paul a bond-servant of Jesus Christ; it would not be quite so proper to call Christ a bond-servant of Paul.

R. DONALDSON.

Fintona, October 25th, 1889.

SIR,—I do not write to interfere in the controversy between Mr. Murphy and Mr. Donaldson, respecting the ultimate condition in a future state of being of those who pass, unrepentant of their sins, from the present state, but to point out what seem to me certain errors of method in reasoning employed by the latter-named of your correspondents.

Mr. Donaldson gives a definition of *demonstration*, and he speaks as though he regards evidence, proof, demonstration, and *ἐλεγχος* as sundry names for the same thing. He speaks, too, as if he regards putting an argument into the form of a syllogism or a sorites to be equivalent to effecting a demonstration.

Now evidence is a fact or a sum of facts that furnishes ground upon which to build proof—proof, that is, of a conclusion derived from them and their relations. Proof is the establishment of a conclusion, with more or less of probability from evidence of fact and from admissible relevant considerations. Demonstration is proof in the highest degree of certainty, either in the absolute degree, leaving no room whatever for doubt or dispute, or in a degree nearly absolute, leaving so little room that doubt, while just possible to be imagined, is yet unreasonable. *Ελεγχος* has no exact English equivalent; it is something between *evidence* and *proof*, compounding part of what belongs to both. From this it appears that Mr. Donaldson's definition of *demonstration* is quite erroneous.

A syllogism is not a demonstration nor a proof. It is the form into which a proof may be put. It may be used for establishing a true conclusion, or as easily

a false one. But its real usefulness is, that it affords through exactness of statement and expression, facility in discovering fallacy, should there be such in the reasoning that the syllogism puts into form.

Anyone acquainted with Bishop Butler ought to know nearly all this. Your correspondent must think on entirely wrong lines if he imagines that everything that ought to be believed is susceptible of demonstration, or even of a high degree of proof. Neither the axioms of Euclid, nor the essential conceptions of mental and moral science, can indeed be proved at all; they must be assumed. This demonstration, besides, that is so craved after, is a thing that addresses itself to the mere animal understanding (*ψυχικός*) of men. It is the peculiar and God-like faculty of the spiritual understanding, which is a far higher prerogative than any that belongs to the animal, to be capable of seeing truths that could never be the subject of proof. One but wastes argument on morals in talking to a man in whom the conscience has grown depraved through vice and sin; your arguments may be good, but they will prove nothing to him. Conversely, awaken—you will be able to do this if God blesses you in it—awaken his conscience, and he will become converted from the error of his ways independent of arguments. Where St. Paul, too, says *πάντα δοκιμάζετε*, he does not mean *demonstrate*; he means, examine and exercise your own judgment. *Prove* is not a very good rendering.

With regard to the translation of *δοῦλος*, whether servant, bond-servant, or slave, does this matter much? One point, however, is very plain; *δοῦλος* is not the same as *διάκονος*, as one must suppose, from Mr. Donaldson's quotation of Matt. xx. 28, that he imagines it to be.

B.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE following address to the Bishop of Lincoln is in process of signature by the clergy in several rural deaneries:—"We, being clergy of your lordship's diocese, having learned through your recent Charge that though you were prepared loyally to submit to the trial by the Archbishop as Metropolitan of the charges made against you, yet that you nevertheless held that these would have been in your opinion more fittingly tried by the Archbishop presiding in a synod of the province, as laid down by the first Lambeth Conference, venture respectfully to express our concurrence in this view. We believe that a trial in synod is more in accordance with ancient precedent, and would be more satisfactory to the Church at large.

It is announced (says the *Pall-Mall Gazette*) that the arguments in the House of Lords in the case of the Rev. J. Bell-Cox will have to be commenced *de novo*, in consequence of the death of Lord Fitz-Gerald, one of the members of the court. When the matter comes on again, Lord Bramwell will sit in the place of the deceased peer.

THE Oxford University sermon in St. Mary's, on Sunday morning, 17th inst., was preached by the Rector of Exeter. At the close of it he made the following reference to the death of Dr. Hatch:—"Here the sermon should have ended. But since

these pages were written, a calamity has befallen us to which I cannot but refer. Dr. Edwin Hatch has been removed by death after a brief illness, when it seemed that the brightest and most fruitful part of his career still lay before him. The indefatigable worker is at rest; the pen has dropped from the busy hand; the active brain is still. It is hard now to realise that his life's work has all come to an end. I will not now speak as a friend might be allowed to speak of a friend. Nor is this the time, if I had the power, to estimate the value of his contributions to theology. But every one here can have only one feeling of sorrow for the loss which his death has inflicted on theological learning in Oxford and in England. His example has done much to stimulate and to recommend the dispassionate study of facts without which theology, like other sciences, is but a sickly plant. His conclusions would not have been considered even by himself, as more than stepping-stones. Many persons dissented from them; but every one must admire the pains and candour he showed in arriving at them. His unquestioning mastery of the field which he had made his own, and his wide and accurate acquaintance with other branches of theology, enforced attention. He deserved a hearing because he never acquiesced in anything less than the best and most exact knowledge attainable. His was the same spirit as that of our great living divine and commentator on St. Paul, the acknowledged leader of theological learning in England. Surely this spirit must ultimately prevail. Everything short of the truth must vanish away. Systems in which facts are suppressed and distorted have their day. But they are in their nature transient. Truth alone can ultimately endure, and only in the truth is final agreement possible. May there never be wanting a succession of English theologians who, with no blinding prepossessions, shall set themselves to learn the will of God as it is revealed in the facts of history, of literature, of human nature, and the constitution of the world. If the unwearied industry and the devotion of the friend whom we lament shall help others to realise the high ideal of a student's duty after which he strove himself, then he will not have lived in vain."

A MEETING was held at Farnham Castle on Friday, the 22nd inst., by special invitation of the Bishop of Winchester and Mrs. Harold Browne, at which the Duchess of Albany, patroness of the Mothers' Union in the Winchester diocese, was present. The meeting was held in the grand old hall of the castle, and about 300 ladies attended from all parts of the diocese. The proceedings were opened with prayer and a short address by the Bishop, expressive of his great appreciation of the work of this society in his own diocese. The Bishop of Guildford followed, and gave some interesting statistics concerning the spread of the Mothers' Union, not only in the Winchester diocese, where 215 parishes had joined the society, and many other dioceses where a similar or kindred work was carried on, but from distant parts of the world—India, America, Australia, Canada, &c.—letters were being received asking for particulars of the work or stating that it was already started. The Bishop mentioned that the sale of the *Mothers' Union Journal* had reached to 54,000 this year, and he spoke earnestly on the value of having the two sacraments placed on the cards as showing the religious foundations on which the work was based. A speech was then made by Mrs. Sumner (diocesan president of the Mothers' Union)

on "The Need of the Mothers' Union," on the necessity of gaining the leadership of lady mothers throughout England, and on the principles of the work. The Dowager Marchioness of Hertford then spoke on "How to meet difficulties in keeping the rules of the Mothers' Union in all classes." Miss Yonge's subject was "The Importance of Parents' Influence and Care of their Children," and the Hon. Mrs. Brodrick, "Woman's Kingdom."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Anderson, Rev. F. W., M.A., Rector of Ovingdean, Sussex.
 Averill, Rev. G., M.A., Rector of Claypole, Lincolnshire.
 Bedford, Rev. W. C. R., M.A., Vicar of Knowle; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.
 Blakeney, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Bishopthorpe; Vicar of Acaster, Malbis, York.
 Bowden, Rev. H. A., Incumbent of Norval, Diocese of Niagara Curate of Dunster, Somerset.
 Boys, Rev. Herbert Arnold, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.
 Browne, Rev. Wilfrid Gore, M.A., Perpetual Curate of the District Chapelry of St. Hilda, Darlington.
 Campbell, Rev. S., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Clay-hill.
 Clarke, Rev. C. H., B.A., Vicar of Hayling, Hants.
 Greenhall, Rev. R., M.A., Rector of Stockleigh English, Devonshire.
 Gregory, Rev. Christopher, Curate of St. Barnabas's, Pimlico; Curate-in-Charge of Woolverstone, Ipswich.
 Heanley, Rev. R. M., M.A., Rector of Wainfleet All Saints, and Hon. Secretary Universities' Mission to Central Africa; Vicar of Upton Grey, near Winchester, Hants.
 Jones, Rev. John R., Curate of Rainford, near St. Helen's; Curate-in-Charge of Farnworth, near Widnes.
 Jones, Rev. Thomas Edwin, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. James's, Upper Bangor; Vicar of Bangor.
 Laycock, Rev. J. M., M.A., Vicar of Charles, Plymouth; Vicar of St. John's, Highbury.
 Lowe, Rev. William, Rector of Elton, Durham.
 MacDonald, Rev. Angus, Perpetual Curate of South Marston, Wilton.
 Malim, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Third-class; Chaplain to the Forces, Second-class.
 Mazuchelli, Rev. F. F. Mari-Fortunatus, D.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Felmersham, Beds.
 Onslow, Rev. M. R. S., M.A., Chaplain to the *Tamar* (temporary).
 Powell, Rev. J. T., Curate of Swaffham; Vicar of Castleacre and Newton, Norfolk.
 Poynder, Rev. Clement, M.A., Chaplain of H.M. Prison, Horfield, Bristol.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Andrew, Rev. William Wayte, M.A., Oxon, at Stoneleigh, Sawbridgeworth, Herts, on the 21st inst., aged 84.
 Davenport, Rev. John Charles, Rector of Skeffington, Leicestershire, at 16, Park-crescent, Oxford, on the 23rd inst., aged 83.
 Hope, Rev. Robert, at Old Radford Vicarage, Nottingham, on the 22nd inst., aged 37.
 Ram, Rev. George Stopford, Vicar of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, at Dromoland Castle, County Clare, on the 19th inst., aged 51.
 Voigt, Rev. George, at Dulwich, on the 23rd inst.



The Church of England Pulpit.

SELF-SACRIFICE.

BY THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY, ON BEHALF
OF THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE LEAGUE.

"We, then, that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification. For even Christ pleased not Himself."—ROM. xv. 1—3.

EVERY one who has read this part of the Epistle to the Romans knows very well that the Apostle is dealing with a very important question of Christian practice—namely, what is the Christian's duty with regard to things not in themselves indifferent. There are things where the rule of right and wrong is so plainly marked out that there is no question at all about the duty of the Christian; there are things as to which our conscience speaks so plainly—and not the conscience of the individual only, but the conscience of the whole human race—that there is no room for any deliberation whatever, and we are bound by the law which God has thus written in our hearts. But there are also a great many things which are left to our own discretion, as to which there is no rule of right distinctly laid down at all—where, in fact, the right and the wrong depend entirely on the circumstances of the case, and perhaps vary in different men. It is with regard to our conduct in these latter that the Apostle is here speaking, and laying down the general rule which is to govern all our decisions for ourselves in such matters. And it is obvious that the use that we make of our own Christian liberty in relation to things indifferent—the use we make of the discretion that is left to ourselves—is, in some respects, even more important than obedience to plain laws of right; because in regard to all questions where the right and the wrong are precisely defined there is no room for the spirit and character of a man to show itself—the rule is prescribed for us, as it were, and in that case it is impossible to judge by the way in which a man acts whether or not there is anything in him of true devotion to the Lord, whether or not his spirit and his soul are penetrated by the love of Christ and the love of his fellow men for the sake of Christ. Therefore it is that very often in these indifferent matters the Christian shows his true character, and very often it is possible to judge a man's life better by what he does in regard to them than by his conduct in other respects. There are, then, things in which we

are free; but, nevertheless, it would be a grievous mistake to suppose that we shall have to give no account of our conduct in them. There are things where the law does not distinctly bind us, and yet, for all that, we shall be asked in what spirit we have acted when they have crossed our path. Nay, it may be said that the great difference between the law and the Gospel is precisely shown here. The precept of the law is always "do"; that of the Gospel is always "be." "To be" is higher than "to do," because it embraces "to do" within it. To do deeds of mercy is only a part of the precept to be merciful; to do deeds of kindness is only a part of the precept to be kind; to do justice to others is only a part of the precept to be just; and the Gospel requires not merely that man's deeds should be in accordance with God's law, but that his spirit should also be penetrated with the spirit of that law, and that his deeds should be in harmony with his inner life, and with all that comes forth from that inner life. The idle word which was not intended to convey any deliberate meaning, the passing look, the very gesture, and all that concerns those little details of ordinary conduct in which, perhaps, more than in anything else, is the man seen, in these things that are indifferent, and in regard to which our Christian liberty is left entirely untrammelled, we must show our Christian spirit. And what is the spirit in which the Christian will handle things that are indifferent? There can be but one answer for any reader of the New Testament—it must be the spirit of self-sacrifice. Self-sacrifice is essential to the Christian life; it is quite impossible for any man without it to follow Christ. The Lord Himself warns us that unless we forsake all that we have, and take up our cross and follow Him, it is impossible for us to be His disciples. Self-sacrifice is the essential mark of the Christian, and the absence of it is sufficient at once to condemn the man who calls himself by that name, and yet has it not, and to declare that he has no right to it. Self-sacrifice is again and again pointed out to us as the one special way in which we are to follow the example of our Lord. "He pleased not Himself." It was He who became poor for our sakes that we might become rich; it was He who humbled Himself, and though in the form of God took upon Him the form of a servant; and the mind that was in Christ Jesus must, we are told, be in us also, and that in such a way that every man must look not upon his own things but upon the things of others. Self-sacrifice is, of necessity, the salt of the whole Christian character, and without it the Christian life is salt without the savour. Self-sacrifice is the test by which, above every other test, a man may know whether or not he is really a Christian at all.

Of course self-sacrifice takes various forms. In the first place, it is clear enough that that self-sacrifice is required of us which makes us fight

against our own sins, and battle all through life with our thoughts; and the man who is not so fighting is no longer living a Christian life, nor has any right to call himself a Christian. And, here indeed, we are not upon the ground of things indifferent—the faults against which we are to struggle; for conscience warns us that they are against the law of God. It is plain enough that the man who is neglecting to fight this battle is altogether giving up the title of Christian; is refusing to bear the very first cross that is laid upon his shoulders; is not following Christ at all. It may be that a man goes on for a long time fancying that all is right with him whilst he lets his faults alone, perhaps himself acknowledging that they are there, but taking no heed of them: it may be that the man may delude himself by the vain theory that because Christ hath purchased forgiveness of our sins, therefore He hath not required us to bear the cross which He bore for our sakes. But assuredly, if the New Testament be true, that cross every man must bear all his life through, and if any be refusing to bear it we can but pray to Almighty God to give him an awakening, that he may know that that is not the Christian life. Then there is the self-sacrifice that is sometimes demanded for the sake of great principles, for a cause, for a great purpose, for some great truth. It may be that many are called forth by a demand which they cannot refuse to hear; many are called to make a sacrifice of themselves, and of all that they hold most dear, in order that they may promote God's will in some special manner—in order that they may fulfil some special task which He, in His providence, hath thought fit to lay upon them. This is a self-sacrifice that may be demanded of any, that is demanded from not a few, but perhaps is not demanded at all of some. There is another mission to which every Christian soul is called, and from which no Christian that deserves the name can be allowed to flinch; there is one demand that is made upon every soul among us—a demand made by our Lord, who died for us, and made by His very death—we are called to self-sacrifice for the sake of our fellow-men. We are called to self-sacrifice for their good; we are called to do what we can to help them to happiness, to help them to blessedness; we are called by the voice of the Lord Himself not to be indifferent to their woes, and wants, and sin; and if we turn a deaf ear to the call it is impossible to say that we are following Christ. We are called all through life, not to think of ourselves, but to think of others, and to see every moment what it is that we can do to help and bless them. And this kind of self-sacrifice, my brethren, is one that, in some shape or other, most of us acknowledge readily enough—acknowledge, that is, that it is wrong to be indifferent to our neighbours; that it is selfish and un-Christian to be regardless of what is best for them. We acknowledge it; and yet how con-

tented we are sometimes to go almost all through life and do so very little, whilst others are suffering so very much! Is it not very often the case that our lives are so easy, so comfortable; that there is so little put upon us to bear in our own homes; that there is so little demand for any effort, for any giving up, for any self-surrender, that it almost seems as if the cross of Christ had not to be borne? Is it not the case with many of us that whilst we acknowledge that, according to the teaching of the New Testament, we cannot serve Christ without forsaking all things, yet, when we look into our lives, we find that we forsake almost nothing; that we cannot lay our hands upon any one thing which is a real sacrifice on our part; that we turn away from the very idea of it; that we go on day after day as if there were no tie that bound us to our fellows, and as if the great mass of misery in the midst of which we are living was no concern of ours? Brethren, if we are to help our fellow-men, there may be no question about it. According to all the teaching of the New Testament, we cannot help them for nothing; we cannot help them without cost; we can bring them no blessing by simply taking our own ease; unless we are ready to make real sacrifices we can do nothing for them.

My brethren, it is my purpose this evening to speak to you about one particular self-sacrifice. I have been asked to preach to you about the sacrifice of one particular pleasure—a pleasure which, I daresay, is a great enjoyment to a great many; a pleasure which I am not condemning as in itself containing anything whatever that is wrong; a pleasure which, like all other human pleasures, in its place and in its time, may fitly be spoken of as one of the gifts of God. And yet I wish to put before you reasons why you should give it up entirely. For I am asking you to consider what is one of the main causes of the terrible suffering of a vast mass of your fellow-countrymen, and still more of your fellow-citizens here in this metropolis; to consider what it is that at this moment degrades and brutalises so many; what it is that is the cause of so much of their poverty, disease and crime; what it is that at this moment does more than anything else to fill the gaol, and to bring men to the workhouse, and to send men to lunatic asylums, to deprive little children of their food, and of their education; and even of their clothing; what it is that brings cruelty more often than anything else, brings it within the sacred circle of domestic life. I will ask you to consider what is the cause of these evils. You know very well (it is impossible for any man to live in this place without knowing) that intemperance has caused more of this dreadful mischief than anything else that can be named. And if you could get rid of it, there is no one thing that could be done that would be a greater blessing to the mass of the people than that. I do not say that if you could get rid of it it would at once regenerate mankind; I do not say

that there would not still be sin and suffering ; I do not say that to cast it out would be a panacea for all the evils that are now amongst us. I know well that there are other causes, not a few, which bring about similar results. I know well that if you look at other sins in themselves, and count them separately without reference to their consequences to others, you may find worse sins far than intemperance ; sins, no doubt, that degrade the soul lower, sins that condemn the man more severely, sins that separate a man from his God more entirely, sins that are more severely reprov'd by our Lord in His warnings recorded in His word. I grant all this, and yet I say that it still remains the fact that of all the causes that can be gathered together of the suffering of the poor and the miserable, there is no other that can stand by the side of intemperance. I am asking you to-day to lay that to your hearts, to think "What have I done, and what can I do, to get rid of such an evil ; what can I do for my brother sunk down in this dreadful degradation ?" You can give your money. Yes, with the dreadful thought perpetually accompanying the gift that in hundreds of cases the money that you will give will be worse than wasted by being spent upon these very indulgences. Yes, you may give your money, and you cannot tell how much of it will do good, and how much of it will do positive harm. You may give your money and pass by. The gift of money has this in it that always takes away from the value of the gift—that it rarely brings the giver and the receiver heart to heart. Most often the giver forgets the receiver as soon as he can ; most often the money is given in order to satisfy the emotions stirred up by the immediate sight of the misery to be relieved ; most often very little personal love goes with the gift, and very often, indeed, little of thought and care. Nay, you may attempt to teach them the evil of their ways, and then you will see how the entrance to man's conscience is absolutely barred against you by the sin in which he has indulged so long ; how the habit that has been formed has so weakened his miserable will that with all his effort he can do nothing to follow the wisest precepts ; how his understanding has been clouded so that he cannot take in the very plainest instructions ; how all your efforts are set at naught because, in spite of everything that you can do here, there is, as it were, one dreadful mass of such degradation that you cannot pierce it ; and that, though you may rescue one soul here and one there, the great majority remain deaf to all your most earnest calls. And what, then, remains ? Brethren, you know very well that these sins can only be fought, whether in ourselves or in others, by one method. All sins of the flesh can be dealt with in one way, and one way only ; they can only be dealt with by removing the temptation. If a man has to deal with his own body, if he has to keep himself from all those sins which touch

his body, he needs but little experience to tell him that flight from the temptation is his one resource. In regard to all these sins of the flesh, all these bodily appetites, there is no measuring the difference between the tempted and the untempted man. The man who is in presence of temptation is a totally different creature from the same man when the temptation is removed. He who is strong when the temptation is not by, he who would never seek it if it were at all hard to find, he who has perhaps learnt the evil of it and has not yet been absolutely entangled in its power, he knows full well that if he could but keep away from the presence of it, the power which it exerts over him would indeed be small. The one thing that we can do is to remove the temptation. I ask all those that hear me to consider this question. I do not say to you this must be the sacrifice that you are to make. Every man must choose his own sacrifice, and no man can prescribe for another. I do not say to you that here is a plain rule of right which you are bound to follow. No, the sacrifice by its very nature must be voluntary, your own choice, or it is not a true sacrifice to God. But I do say this, that you cannot escape making a sacrifice for the sake of your fellow man if you are to live a Christian life, that you cannot escape from it, and that the question is not whether you are to sacrifice or not your own pleasure or your own comfort, but what is the sacrifice that is best to make, whether this or that is the right thing to do. Let it be granted that the pleasure obtained from the consumption and use of these things is a legitimate pleasure in itself ; let it be granted that there is nothing wrong whatever in enjoying that pleasure to the full, provided a man guards his own body against excess ; let it be granted that each man has to choose for himself what sacrifice he will make ; but, when that is granted, I beg of you to ask, Is there anything that we can do for which there is a plainer demand, in the present circumstances of our people, than to make a sacrifice—an entire and absolute sacrifice if we can—each in his own person, of the pleasure that can be got from these innocent things ? To me it seems that there is hardly anything else which is better worth doing for the sake of the poor. I have come, as you know, but lately to this diocese to do what part God may assign me for the spiritual good of my fellow-creatures here. I am come to a task which certainly will tax human strength to the utmost. I am come to do a duty which every effort that I can make cannot fulfil, and if I had a right to call upon my fellow-men here to help me in the work, above all others this is what I should ask them to do—join me, each in his own person, in giving up altogether what is so terrible a temptation to our fellow-men. I do not ask you to condemn it as a thing sinful in itself. I am quite willing to admit that sometimes fanatical and foolish language has been used by

those whose hearts have been wrung by the sight of the misery they have seen, and who have, therefore, been driven out of all carefulness of speech ; for it is not when the heart feels deeply that it is always possible strictly to restrain the words within the accurate line of reason. I do not ask you to adopt what they say, or to accept their lead ; but I ask you to consider, when there is this terrible evil, and when the one thing that can be done is, if not to remove it altogether, yet, at any rate, to diminish the temptation, if you cannot do your part in this by a personal self-sacrifice of your own enjoyment ? I believe that there is nothing else that you can do that would have so great a moral and spiritual power at this moment. It may be if we could conquer this enemy now, all such effort might be altogether needless forty or fifty years hence. But now, as things are at this hour, when this is doing so much mischief, can you not help me to stem the evil current by a personal self-sacrifice in such a matter ? I do not know who might find it a great sacrifice and who a small ; but I know this, that every man who is willing to make the self-sacrifice does swell the power of those who are endeavouring with all their might to get this dreadful temptation from the immediate presence of the victims to it. I know that whatever has been done in this direction has been done in this way ; and I see no prospect that by any other means the good of our fellow-men in this particular can be reached. I beg of you to ask yourselves whether it is too much to give up as your contribution to an effort which the present state of our countrymen makes necessary even a great pleasure, if it be a great pleasure ? I do not ask you to give it up as something to be condemned, but to give it up for the sake of Christ, and for the sake of Christ's people : for the sake of Him who died for the love of you, of Him who bade you repay Him by your love of them, to give it up in order that, by the moral power that you could so exert, they may be strengthened in their battle. And nothing else can strengthen them so much. Indeed, I believe that if all those in this great city who call themselves Christians would absolutely give it up for a few years, we should succeed in making so vast a difference that it would be visible to all men that that sacrifice had redeemed many souls, and that even if there still remained much that was sinful, much degradation, and much misery, yet, at least, one large part of it was gone, because Christians had learned to feel one for another, and the man battling with this dreadful foe would find all around him those who stood shoulder to shoulder with himself, taking part, even though they needed it not for their own sakes, in the same great conflict in which he found himself engaged. Cheered and encouraged by their mere presence, by the knowledge that they felt for him and felt with him, how many a soul would not be able to win who now

feels that he has no chance because, wherever he goes, the temptation meets him at every step, comes across him in almost every action, in almost every detail of his intercourse with his fellows ; for although he may long to flee the temptation, the temptation still pursues him, and he knows not how he shall escape it ?

My dear brethren, I have spoken from the fullness of my heart, I know well that there must be many who do not look upon this as I do, and I am not asking any man to give up his own opinion or his own conviction, or in the slightest degree to vary from the guidance of his own conscience, but I entreat you, as Bishop of this great diocese, I implore you, to put this question fairly to yourselves, and with the words of the Lord Jesus Christ full in your minds, to ask, What sacrifice can I make for my neighbours, good to edification ?

RACING AND WRESTLING: IMAGES OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

BY THE REV. C. B. BRIGSTOCKE, M.A., ENGLISH CHAPLAIN AT HOMBURG, GERMANY, AND AUTHOR OF "QUEEN VICTORIA'S JUBILEE," "THE MODERN ATHEIST," AND OTHER SERMONS.

SERMON PREACHED IN CHRIST CHURCH, VIRGINIA WATER, SURREY, ON SUNDAY, MARCH 17TH, 1889.

"I therefore so run as not uncertainly ; so fight I as not beating the air ; but I buffet my body and bring it into bondage ; lest by any means, after I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected."—I COR. ix. 26, 27 (Revised Version).

THE celebrated Isthmian games of olden times took place every other year in the neighbourhood of Corinth. These games excited immense interest. So intense indeed was the interest excited in these periodic celebrations, that they became to the Greeks, as has been well said, "rather a passion than an amusement." They consisted chiefly of racing, wrestling, leaping, boxing, and throwing the quoit. They took place in a large area called the Stadium. The regulations respecting those who took part in these contests were very strict. None were allowed to contend in the games but those of pure Hellenic blood. Foreigners might be spectators, but slaves were entirely excluded. "A candidate might be disqualified by certain moral and political offences. He was obliged to take an oath that he had been ten months in training, and that he would violate none of the regulations." "The candidate was obliged to practise again in the gymnasium immediately before the games, under the direction of judges or umpires, who were themselves required to be instructed for ten months in the details of the games." The competitors took their places by lot. It was

the duty of the herald to summon them into the stadium. It was the duty of the judge, when all were ready, to exhort them to acquit themselves nobly—to give the signal to commence, and to award the prize.

The prize was a chaplet or crown of green leaves. It was a simple one, but it was much coveted, for it secured for the conqueror the greatest distinction. It was thought to shed lustre not only over his own family, but over the State to which he belonged. Hence the name of the victor and that of his father and that of his country were proclaimed by a herald before the representatives of assembled Greece. Their statues were frequently erected in the most frequented part of the city, and at the public cost. They were generally relieved from the payment of taxes, and also enjoyed the first seats in all public games.

Now there is an obvious allusion to these games in the Apostle's language, and specially to the contests of racing and wrestling. The severe training the Greek athlete underwent, and the ardour with which he sought to obtain the coveted prize, furnished the Apostle in writing to the Church at Corinth with an apt illustration of the severe self-discipline that the Christian is called upon to undergo. "Now they do it to receive a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible."

The text is thus translated by Conybeare and Howson: "I, therefore, run not like the racer who is uncertain of his goal;" *i.e.*, uncertain of the point at which he is aiming: "I fight not as the pugilist who strikes out against the air"; *i.e.*, who vainly hits into the air instead of striking his antagonist: "*but* I bruise my body and force it into bondage; lest, perchance, having called others to the contest, I should myself fail shamefully of the prize."

Alford translates the 27th verse thus: "But I bruise my body and enslave it, lest perchance having proclaimed to others, I myself may prove rejected from the prize."

The term (*ὑποπιάζω*) translated "bruise" is a pugilistic term, and implies striking heavily in the face so as to render black and blue.

We have thus a striking picture of the Christian life. The Apostle transports us in thought to the stadium of a Greek city, and directs our attention to the runner divested of all superfluous clothing, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, but pressing ceaselessly, steadily, onwards till at length the goal is reached, and the victor's presence is hailed with the plaudits of an admiring crowd. There, says the Apostle, is the picture of the Christian. He directs our attention again to the man engaged in a pugilistic encounter, and putting forth all his strength to throw down his adversary. There, says the Apostle, is another picture of the Christian. In the racer we have *the Christian's steadiness of aim set before us*. In the wrestler we have represented to us *the ceaseless*

energy that the Christian must put forth, if bent on triumphing over his dread antagonist.

Oh! if figures like these have any meaning at all, the Christian life is not an easy life. The path to heaven is not a path strewn with flowers. No man will ever get there who has not something of the hero in him, who knows nothing of the sterling virtues of the racer and the wrestler, who has not the steady aim of the one and the determined energy of the other. In the picture placed before us by the Apostle, we see at once that vacillating indecision of character and selfish indolence are just as fatal to success as open rebellion and downright disobedience to God. Moral weakness and want of principle will as surely debar us from the heavenly prize as daring sin and atrocious wickedness.

How many things are there to shake the steadiness of the Christian's aim and to divert him from his course! Who does not know that "the pomps and *vanity* of this wicked world" are held out by an artful adversary to dazzle him and turn him aside? The love of ease, the love of pleasure, the love of dress, the love of reputation—these ensnare many. And when the Christian gives himself up to influences like these, his perception of the work before him grows dim, and the goal, which once shone so brightly before him in the sunlight of heaven, almost disappears from his view. Others, again, are moved by the fear of persecution. They dread above all things to be regarded as singular. Instead of its being a confession of weakness, it is often their boast that they do as others. These have not courage to do what is right, simply because it is right. They do it if it happens to be popular. They are willing to serve God, if at the same time they can offer incense to Mammon. They cannot trust their Master at all times, or believe that what He has commanded He will give strength to accomplish. Their life is a miserable compromise, an evasion of duty, a trifling with conscience, a playing with convictions. These "*did run well*," but it was only for a time.

Not thus was it with the Apostle. "*I therefore so run as not uncertainly.*" There was no unsteadiness of aim, no faltering of purpose about St. Paul. Pleasures could not ensnare him. Persecution could not terrify him. From the moment of his conversion love to Christ was the ruling passion of his soul, and, as he himself tells us, he was "ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xxi. 13). From the moment that he breathed the prayer on the road to Damascus, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" till the time when he said, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand," his life was one grand act of martyrdom. His labours for Christ constitute one of the noblest chapters in the early history of the Church. Driven out of one city, he went and preached the Gospel in another.

He was stoned and scourged and imprisoned, and yet was able to sing hymns of praise in the dungeon. Heedless of obloquy and scorn, careless of the slanderous imputations by which his enemies sought to blacken his fame, he went fearlessly onward in the path his Master had marked out for him. The greater his danger, the more assured was he of his Master's presence. The time came when "all men forsook him"—and to such a man as St. Paul this must have been the keenest of trials—but "the Lord stood by him and strengthened him," as he touchingly says. Even then, abandoned by his friends, deprived of all human sympathy and succour, and the prospect before him of a terrible death, he faltered not in his allegiance, he wavered not in the work that he had undertaken.

His one object in life had been to fulfil "the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus." His one aim now was to "finish his course with joy," and to receive from the hands of his Divine Master "the crown of righteousness." "One thing I do, forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on towards the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. iii. 13, 14).

Again: "*So fight I as not beating the air, but I buffet my body and bring it into bondage.*" These words describe no imaginary struggle, but a very real one. And if the racer sets before us the steadiness of the Christian's aim, the picture of the pugilist portrays the energy with which the Christian must wrestle with his dread antagonist, even unto death.

Alas! of how few Christians is this a faithful description! How many seem to despise their enemy! They carry on a sort of intermittent warfare, and on the faintest signs of success are ready to proclaim a truce, and to think that the struggle is over. At other times they seem to have an imperfect conception of the nature of their adversary, and of the point against which their efforts should be directed. It is *themselves* they have to fight against, paradoxical as it may sound, and it is from their very ignorance of themselves, their indolent refusal to examine themselves, that they fail to discover where their enemy is most vulnerable. Like ignorant pugilists they hit out blindly and strike against the air! Not thus was it with the Apostle. Though a holy man, he felt that he had in himself a real enemy, and that victory over that enemy was not to be achieved without a severe struggle. "I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage"; "I bruise my body, and force it into bondage." You observe that the *present tense* is used, and this implies that even with the Apostle the struggle was ceaseless, continuous, uninterrupted.

The body is the chief seat of Satan's temptations; but it would seem from the context that the

Apostle is not here referring directly to what we call bodily sin—temptations to sensual or bodily indulgence, though these are included—but rather to other more subtle and secret foes that are entrenched within us, and from which God's grace alone can dislodge them.* There comes a time when the struggle with the flesh assumes a tremendous severity, and of this the defeated wrestler, bruised, disfigured, and wounded by the repeated blows of his victorious antagonist, is a graphic picture. There comes a time, too, when that struggle almost ceases. There never comes a time when we have not to contend with that pride or self-will that has characterized our nature since the Fall. This adapts itself to our ever-varying circumstances, and is ever watching its opportunities for attack. It is pride that leads us to follow our own wills, and set at nought the will of God. It is pride that leads us to exaggerate our own merits and excuse our own misdeeds. It is pride that leads us to look contemptuously upon others, admiringly upon ourselves. It is pride that hides from us our own defects, and tempts us to scorn the rebukes of wise and good men. It is pride that prevents us from confessing our faults, even when we have been permitted to see them. It is pride that renders us vain and indolent, selfish and discontented. It is pride that checks the tears of a godly sorrow, and keeps us back from giving ourselves to the service of Him Who died for us and rose again. Till pride has received from us some crushing blow, and is in a measure mortified, we cannot appreciate the value of the Gospel message, or respond to its simplest claims. Till we have commenced in real earnest the struggle with this demon spirit of evil within us, and, aided by God's grace, are doing our best to over-power and crush our adversary, it is vain to call ourselves Christians. We have not the mind of Him Who was "meek and lowly in heart."

We learn from the text that St. Paul trembled lest after all his efforts he himself should be a castaway. "I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage lest by any means, after I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected."

It may seem to us wonderful that a man so holy and so devoted to his Divine Master should express distrust as to the result of his own efforts to win the crown of life. We may well ask, If a Paul trembled, what right have any of us to be self-confident? What are our prayers to his? our labours to his? our sufferings to his?

Some of us, doubtless, believe in the doctrine of final perseverance—that grace once given is never withdrawn, that the soul once united to Christ is an assured partaker of everlasting life.

* "The Apostle is here speaking, as the context (verses 19-23) shows, of breaking down the pride and obstinacy and self-seeking of the natural man by laying himself entirely out for his great work—the salvation of the greatest number."—(Alford in loc.)

We have no desire to speak dogmatically upon such a subject. We do not say that it is distinctly contradicted by the text, but we do say that it is not easy to reconcile the two—the doctrine in question with an inspired Apostle's expression of self-distrust. The language should at any rate teach us the wonderful humility of the saint almost ripe for glory.

The doctrine of final perseverance may be easily abused by our indolent natures. Hence we prefer pressing constantly upon your attention the plain exhortations of Holy Scripture. We bid you, in Apostolic language, to give all diligence "to make your calling and election sure," and to be ever "adding to your faith virtue."

Whatever ambiguity may rest upon some of the revelations of God, nothing is more plainly revealed to us in Holy Scripture than this—that the living Christian is ever active and energetic, engaged in a fierce and continuous conflict with his spiritual foes.

The command is, "*Be thou faithful unto death.*" The promise is, "*And I will give thee*"—the faithful one, the faithful unto death—"the crown of life" (Rev. ii. 10).



THE GLORY OF GOD IN SICKNESS.

BY THE REV. J. A. CARR, LL.D., VICAR.

A SERMON PREACHED IN WHITCHURCH PARISH CHURCH, ON SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 10TH, 1889 (HOSPITAL SUNDAY).

"When Jesus heard that, He said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby."—ST. JOHN, xi. 4.

THE annual recurrence of Hospital Sunday has this advantage, it is sure to remind us in some measure of sickness, and sickness speaks of suffering, and suffering suggests sympathy. It is good for us to have such a recurring appeal to stir up our sympathy and to remind us that we are all partners in distress, and equally the subjects of sickness, and suffering, and finally of death. The poor suffer from sickness and all its accompaniments equally with the rich, but with this difference, that while their means enable the one class to command in a larger or lesser degree the aid of medical skill and the comforts and luxuries of home, the other class are in a large measure dependent upon public charity for these things. A poor man cannot afford to fee a doctor, nor purchase medicines, nor provide surgical appliances, nor obtain proper nourishment in time of sickness for himself, or his wife, or children in the same way that the rich man can. Here it is then that the institution of the hospital comes in to meet a great and acknowledged want, and on every recurring Hospital Sunday we are reminded of the existence of

this great philanthropic and Christian institution designed for the comfort and relief and possible restoration to health and strength of the sick poor.

My brethren, we shall never get rid of sickness; we shall never succeed in driving this, one of many consequences of man's fall from original rectitude, out of the world. We may indeed do much towards its relief, and even in the direction of warding it off for a time, but come it will to us all, and at length in its inevitable form of a final and fatal illness. When we open that most human of all books—the Bible—we find its presence there from the time that we read how one came and said to Joseph, "Behold thy father is sick," up to the glorious revelation of a future and blessed condition of final and everlasting immunity from all the ills that flesh is heir to, when the new earth will be ours, when all things will be made new, and when no longer shall one say to another "I am sick!" When He, the sinless One, visited our world "in great humility," He became intimate with this burthen of human weakness and sickness. He was brought very near to it. It seems often as if He were evermore moving through the wards of some great hospital. He was conversant with "all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people." You cannot read the Gospels without seeing this. We are perpetually told how Christ was brought in contact with sick people, and how He healed them all—

At even ere the sun was set,
The sick, O Lord, around thee lay,
Oh, in what divers pains they met,
Oh, with what joy they went away!

It is one of the strange features of the sacred history that men gifted with miraculous powers for healing the sick do not seem to have been always capable of exercising these powers on behalf of their friends. Thus we have the case of Epaphroditus, St. Paul's "brother and companion in labour and fellow-soldier, and one that ministered to his wants"; "he was sick nigh unto death," but the Apostle does not appear to have been able to exercise his gift of healing on his behalf. Then we have the case of another of his friends and fellow-labourers as it is presented to us in those few but exceedingly pathetic words—"Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick." We can hardly think that the Apostle would have left his brother man, his Christian friend and fellow helper, to pine away in grievous solitude on the bed of sickness had he been able to raise him up and restore him to the full enjoyment of his wonted health. We have in such cases as these no doubt an illustration of our Lord's words: "The spirit bloweth where it listeth," this spirit of healing no less than the other gifts of the same divine Power.

The Church in her wonderful all-embracing solicitude for the members of Christ has not failed to recognise the presence of this ill, and to remember the sick in her prayers. Thus in one of the suffrages

of the Litany we pray to God on behalf of "all sick persons"; they are not forgotten in the prayer "for all estates and conditions of men." In the prayer for "the Church militant here on earth," the Church contending not only against sin and Satan, but forced likewise to do battle against the consequences of sin, prays for the Divine comfort and succour "for all them who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity."

The passage before us this morning has to deal with sickness. It shows us how our Lord was brought in contact with it in the case of His sick friend, Lazarus. His sisters sent a message to Him to say, "He whom thou lovest is sick." And the answer back of our Lord to the message was this: "His sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby."

Now, these words reveal to us three things. They speak to us of the divine foresight or omniscience of our blessed Lord, of the consciousness of His power to neutralise the force of death and restore Lazarus to life, and of the glory that would come to God and to His Son Jesus Christ out of this sickness. With the last of these three subjects alone are we now concerned.

I think that without straining the point we may fairly say that this word "glory" is the keynote of the fourth Gospel. That Gospel was eminently written to set forth the glory of Him who was at once the Son of God and the Son of Man. It was written to let us see in the life-work of Jesus Christ the shining forth of that glory which He had with the Father before the world was. Thus the fourth Evangelist speaks of Christ from the very first as the Light, and he says, "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Our Lord's first miracle was the showing forth of His glory. In the desire of the Greek strangers to see Him, He recognised the approach of the hour when He should be glorified by all men being drawn to His cross. In the case of His approaching denial, when the traitor had gone out into the dark night for his fell purpose, we find our Lord saying: "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him, and God shall glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him." In His high-priestly prayer He desires to be glorified with the glory which He had with God from the beginning of the world, and the close of the Gospel gives us certain notions, dim and indistinct, indeed, of that glory into which He entered after His Resurrection from the dead. The Christ of St. John wears an aureole about His head; while His feet are on this lower earth, He is seen to move in the translucent atmosphere of the eternal world.

We have now to discover in what sense this sickness of Lazarus was to be "for the glory of God." Most persons, perhaps, or probably a very

large number, would say it was so ordained that the glory of Christ might be exhibited in the exercise of His miraculous power in raising him from the dead and restoring him to life. Now I do not think that the true meaning of our Lord's words lies here. I rather think He foresaw the glory that would come to Him through His own death, and therefore the consummation of the great sacrifice for the sins of the world which He would effect by His death on the cross, and which death it is evident was immediately brought about in consequence of this tremendous miracle. It was this raising of Lazarus from the dead that intensified the hatred and opposition of the scribes and Pharisees, and made them ask the question, "What do we, for this Man doeth many miracles?" It was the restoration of Lazarus to life that precipitated the last conspiracy against our Lord which led to His betrayal and death. This was the glory, then, which Lazarus' sickness was to bring about—the glory of self-sacrifice, the glory of the cross, the glory of the great love of God in giving His only-begotten Son to be the propitiation for the sins of the world. That death must be brought about in some way; the sickness, death, and subsequent resurrection of Lazarus were important links in the chain of the divine purpose. "This sickness," said He who always knew what He would do, "is not unto death." He was shortly to go to wake him out of that sleep of death to a renewed existence in this world of shadows; it was "for the glory of God that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." The price paid for the resurrection of Lazarus from the grave was the death of Him who spake those words of power, "Lazarus, come forth!"

And now for the practical part of this discourse. The sickness of men may still be for the glory of God in many ways. It is so, when it is borne in patience and submission to the Divine Will. When the voice of repining is hushed, and the heart of the sufferer can say, "It is the Lord, let Him do what seemeth good in His sight." Sickness is for the glory of God when it excites the sincere penitence of the sufferer, when it leads to true repentance and amendment of life. Sickness is for the glory of God when it draws out the sympathy and loving-kindness of others, and leads to acts of practical generosity and Christian benevolence, as on this Hospital Sunday. Sickness is for the glory of God when its presence stirs up the human mind to devise fresh remedies against disease, when it suggests the putting forth of new and unlooked-for efforts of professional skill, whether in the use of drugs or the exercise of surgical ingenuity. Sickness is for the glory of God when it leads to a fresh interest in sanitary matters, when it leads to housing the poor in more healthy dwelling-places, to greater attention to cleanliness and the decencies of life, to the repression of the too numerous opportunities afforded

for indulging in strong drink (which slays its thousands), and to the universal providing of pure water for the masses. And sickness is for the glory of God when it leads to the last great act of supernatural faith, and enables the dying saint to say with feeble breath, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Sickness is for the glory of God when one more redeemed child of Adam is added to that great multitude whom no man will be able to number, gathered out of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, who will have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb!*

THE Bishop of London, who was consecrated Bishop of Exeter on December 21, 1869, and translated to the see of London in 1885, celebrated his sixty-eighth birthday on Saturday.

THE *Standard* says that Bishop Mitchinson will act as deputy for the Bishop of Dover until January 1st, the date on which Dr. Parry's resignation will take effect. A report that Canon Mason is to succeed the latter is, we are informed, without foundation.

ON Friday evening a presentation was made to Archdeacon Sinclair, on his resignation of the living of St. Stephen's, Westminster, which he has held for the past ten years. The ceremony took place in the Burdett Hall, Rochester-row, the chair being occupied by Mr. Burdett-Coutts, M.P., who was supported by the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, the clergy of the district, and a number of the parishioners. The presentation consisted of an illuminated address, two silver salvers, a silver inkstand, and a silver kettle, subscribed for by the parishioners.

MR. C. F. HARFORD-BATTERSBY, B.A., M.R.C.S., of Trinity College, Cambridge, son of the late Canon Battersby, of Keswick, has been accepted by the Church Missionary Society for Mission work in Africa.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

* Lady Plunket, the wife of the Archbishop of Dublin, had died on the Friday previous.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE**, or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C.B. HARNESSE, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary. **OBESITY IS CURED**, and will be sent, **gratis and post free**, on application to the

Medical Battery Company, Limited,
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

[SATURDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1889.]

OUR ENGLISH CATHEDRALS.

AT the present time there is considerable discussion as to the great need of an increase in the Episcopate. It is felt by many that the Church needs now more than she ever did, definite supervision, and this can only be done by increasing the number of bishops. Some have advocated County Bishops, while others would be satisfied if there were some seven or eight additional Sees. But as there seems to be great difficulty in the way of raising the capital sum of seventy, eighty, or ninety thousand pounds, we appear to have fallen back upon the plan of appointing Suffragan Bishops, as helpers to the present Diocesan Bishops, with a title derived from some town, but with no defined territorial jurisdiction—a plan which in some cases seems to answer, while in others nothing would appear to satisfy, except an increase of territorial Bishops.

Supposing, then, that the desire of these latter were gratified, we should as a matter of course have a great increase in the number of Cathedral Churches, differing in size, architecture, and construction, according to the liberality of people who wish to have them erected. In many cases—perhaps in nearly all—a large and commodious parish church would be made to do the duty of a cathedral, and also be the parish church of the city. Closely connected with this matter arises the questions, What is the use of a cathedral? and what are the functions of a cathedral body? In ancient times the Bishop had his seat in some convenient centre, where he gathered around him his advisers—the forerunners of our present cathedral chapters—and they discussed plans as to the

best mode of carrying on the work they had in hand; and so little by little our cathedrals grew, stately buildings were reared, rich in architectural grace and beauty, chapter houses, generally octagonal in style, were also added, where the Bishop might meet his council—and the service of prayer and praise be rendered with great precision and care. Thus the cathedral was in fact the mother Church of the diocese. In course of time, however, instead of being what they were intended to be—centres of light, learning, and devotion—they became in many places pleasant homes, sinecures for the favoured ones, and the Residentiary Canons did little or nothing for the Church except come into residence at the cathedral for three months in the year, and the remaining nine months were spent at their vicarages or rectories some distance away; and it generally happened that the holder of a canonry receiving a good salary was also the recipient of a good income from some benefice, and possibly had an archdeaconry as well.

Within the last few years improvements have been made in some cathedrals; where possible, when vacancies have arisen, it has been arranged that the holder of the canonry should not hold any other office, but should do some diocesan work when not actually employed at the cathedral. The Bishop of Lichfield, in the charge which he gave at the recent Visitation, has put forth some admirable suggestions as to the work that should be done by the members of a cathedral body. He divides the subject into two parts, the interior and the exterior work. With the interior work he places great stress upon the Chapter being the advisers of the bishops, and the value of mutual counsel as to the best mode of carrying on the work of the Church, and the devotional life and study of its members, thus carrying out as far as possible the objects for which our cathedrals were erected. As regards the exterior work, he looks at it from three points of view, viz., missionary, educational, and theological. There is no doubt that in ancient times the members of the cathedral body, that is, the advisers and workers with the bishops, did real missionary work, going about from place to place, teaching and preaching, and then after the tour was completed returned home to the mother Church, there to be refreshed with spiritual food, to study the word of God, and then go forth renewed with fresh strength, re-invigorated for the work. And so, although times have changed, yet it seems only fitting, and certainly in accordance with ancient ideas, that the Home Mission work should be connected with, and have one member of the Chapter as its controlling head, in the person of a Canon Missioner of the cathedral church of the diocese. Another suggestion bearing upon educational matters is that the important work of catechising should not be lost sight of, and that one member of the Chapter might well be appointed to see that this system is

carried out, and should be able to give some practical assistance in the work. A further suggestion is made that theological lectures, or courses of sermons bearing on definite theological subjects, should be from time to time given in the cathedral, and so keep up the ideal for which our cathedrals were originally intended.

We may also note that some time ago the present Bishop of Manchester, in examining the Statutes of the Cathedral Church, discovered that the work which two of the members of the old Capitular body of the Collegiate Church of Manchester were to do, was to give definite religious teaching to the youth, and he has suggested that two of the Residentiary Canons can well take up this work and supervise religious instruction in the diocese—a most important subject, and one which must commend itself to every right thinking Churchman at the present day.

It is most important that our cathedrals should as far as possible fulfil the intentions of their founders, and that the members of the Chapter should not spend their time in dignified leisure, and just minister to the wants of the selected few who live in the Close and Cathedral precincts, but should do all they can to extend the power and influence of the dear old Church of England.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ST. JOHN VI.

SIR,—I have just finished a careful study of "Christ's Discourse at Capernaum," by Charles Stanley Faber, B.D.—a book most ably written against the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and while I must admire the ability of the learned writer, I am at the same time driven to show what seems to me a fatal mistake which runs through his whole work, and which, instead of weakening the foundations on which Rome's theory stands, would seem to give them additional strength.

The mistake, then, is this:—On page 33 Mr. Faber writes: "The Bread spoken of in the earlier portion of this chapter is explained to be the Flesh spoken of in the latter portion; the *Bread is Christ*, and the Flesh is the Flesh of Christ. The Flesh of Christ is meat, truly, and the Bread from Heaven, which is Christ Himself, is the living Bread or the living Flesh which Christ will give for the life of the world." . . . "Eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, which *jointly constitute Himself*, Who is the true Bread," is the subject alone discoursed and enforced in this chapter.

It is with this what I must call mistaken identification that I and Mr. Faber disagree, because the Flesh and Blood *cannot* "jointly constitute Christ Himself;" for where, then, is His Divinity? Mr. Faber says "the Bread is Christ" and "the Flesh is the Flesh of Christ." Now, I ask, how could "the Flesh of Christ" be Christ Himself? or how could

"the Blood of Christ" be Christ Himself? And where does Christ say, "I am the Flesh," or "I am the Blood"? He does say, "My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed"; but this is a very different thing. Where Christ speaks of Himself, and says, "I am the Bread of Life," He speaks of Himself as God and Man. But where He speaks of the Bread that He will give for the life of the world, He speaks of that Human Body (consisting of His Flesh and Blood) which He gave over to the death of the Cross, to which state He could not give His Deity. His Flesh and Blood He could give, and did give, for the life of the world; but who will say that He could give His Deity to death.

Mr. Faber, in page 47, quotes our Lord's own words: "Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." Here is plainly stated that the Flesh and Blood constitute a part or portion of the Son of Man, and could not, therefore, themselves stand for Himself—Body, Soul, and Divinity. Eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood may mean coming to Him and believing on Him, as He Himself says: "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger, and He that believeth on Me shall never thirst"; and therefore coming to Him and believing on Him may be the same as eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, which prevents that spiritual hunger and thirst, both of which imply a belief in that, which the giving of that Flesh and Blood, viz., His Human Body, to the death of the Cross, procured for man.

Plainly, then, we are driven to the conclusion that the "Bread" in the words "I am the Bread of Life," and the "Bread which I shall give is My Flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world," are not *co-identical*, and could not be so, for a part can never stand for or constitute the whole.

On page 68 Mr. Faber writes: "Our Lord explicitly declares the Bread from Heaven to be His Flesh." Here I must say I totally disagree with the writer, because our Lord could never say the Bread from Heaven is His Flesh, for His Flesh never came down from Heaven, but was born of the substance of the Virgin Mary. What came down from Heaven was His Godhead, which was united to His Manhood on earth. And this truth is most fully borne out by His own words in the 32nd verse of this chapter: "But My Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven." Here what God the Father gave was the true Bread from Heaven, or, as Jesus Himself says in the next verse, "He which cometh down from Heaven," namely, His only-begotten Son, whom God the Father gave, and who took on Him our flesh, which He gave for the life of the world. Well may He then say in the 35th verse, "I am the Bread of Life."

In his conclusion Mr. Faber states his argument to be the following: "Since Christ declares the Bread from Heaven to be His Flesh, the eating of His Flesh must plainly be the same as the eating of the Bread." This, I think, has been shown above to be incorrect. But if my interpretation be wrong, and Mr. Faber be correct in identifying the words, "I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven," with the words, "The Bread which I shall give is My Flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world," he certainly lends an additional force to arguments in favour of the doctrine of Transubstantiation; for they, who assert that where His Human Body is there must His Divinity be also, can therefore bring forward this verse to prove that, in His own words, to eat His

Flesh and to drink His Blood must mean to eat Himself—Body, Soul, and Divinity; and what they thus eat must be a living Being, since it were impossible to join a living Divinity to a dead body, and therefore there must be created by transubstantiation the whole living Saviour—God and Man—Body, Soul, and Divinity in every Host.

Cardinal Wiseman's book, "Lectures on the Holy Eucharist," is largely quoted by Mr. Faber in order to refute his statements, but the Cardinal failed, at least in this book, to see the point of difference which I have endeavoured to make plain; or, if he did, to take advantage of the difference to support his specious arguments.

This review, if review it could be called, of so old a work, I was prompted to make by reading a letter which appeared some six months ago in the columns of your paper, asking for a solution of the difficulty which lay in these verses, a difficulty which had not originally presented itself to my mind; and, as I have not met the same difficulty grappled with in any Commentary, I leave to the writer of that letter the credit of being the first to start the question.

INQUIRENS.

[In discussing this most important chapter our correspondent seems to forget that there is a very close and beautiful analogy between the human physical body and the mode in which it is framed, constituted, and nourished, and that spiritual body of which Christ is the Head and we are the members. This analogy was clearly and forcibly pointed out by Canon Rawstorne in a sermon on "The Parable of the Body and Blood of Christ," in our Vol. XV.—ED.]

THE PRINCIPLES OF ACTION.

SIR,—The controversy now proceeding between Mr. Donaldson and others suggests to me the advisability of putting before your readers the fact that there are three *principles of action*. I am sure, if they think out the fact and all that it means, it will enable them to distinguish a little more clearly the things that differ.

These three principles are—and I wish to emphasise the point—(1) Instinct; (2) Reason; (3) Faith. Print the words in capitals, Mr. Editor. They are important.

(1) **INSTINCT**.—This principle is God-given. It is the guiding principle of the lower animals. It is not allowed to operate very largely in man. It would be better for him if it were. It is unerring. The bird, for instance, never mis-builds its nest.

(2) **REASON**.—This principle is characteristic, as I need scarcely say, of the whole human race. This obtains, of course, in a greater or less degree. It is God-given, but, like all else that is human, is tainted with sin. It is not unerring. It goes as often wrong as right. Take an illustration: Show a dog a jug of whiskey. He will put his nose in the jug, smell it, and almost simultaneously, with his tail between his legs, he will walk away. I need not say how man, with his superior knowledge, regards it. His reason, of course, operates, and he drinks!

(3) **FAITH**.—This is God-given. "Faith is the gift of God." It is unerring. It links the soul, through the dear Redeemer, on to God. It draws all its support—grace, knowledge, wisdom—from God. And this it does directly. This is the great principle that

guides the inner workings of the soul. It is the instinct of the soul.

It would be impossible, in a letter to a newspaper, to do full justice to a subject of this kind. I do not pretend to. But I should like to point out an error into which, as I take it, our evolutionist friends have fallen. They affirm that reason is only instinct developed. They say that it is hard to say where instinct ends and reason begins. It will be seen from the above that they are two different principles as distinct in their operations as the functions of seeing and hearing.

There are those again who cannot and do not distinguish between the functions of reason and faith. "Faith is higher reason." Hence such controversies as the present. Reason can split hairs. Cf. what our worthy friend "B." has written. Faith grasps the truth. It reasons about it afterwards.

Might I just say that I pointed out long ago that accepting the term *αἰώνιος* in the sense of age-long does not help the universalist a bit? How can it when the age which succeeds this is never-ending?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage,
Nov. 9th, 1889.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I may have expressed myself too absolutely in saying that *αἰών* in the singular never means absolutely endless time, but in the three instances quoted by Mr. Donaldson in the PULPIT of the 29th ult., where *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* certainly means *for ever* in the fullest sense, the meaning of absolute eternity does not belong to the mere words, but is read into them, quite rightly, from other sources of information. In 1 Corinthians viii. 13, St. Paul says: "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*," which the authorised version quite truly translates, "While the world standeth"—that is to say, for a limited, and for anything that St. Paul knew, not a very long time.

On the question of a final restoration I have no wish to repeat what I have often written in your columns as to the testimony of Scripture. I will at present only mention the promise in Genesis iii. 15: "The seed of the woman (Christ) shall crush the serpent's head. To crush the head of any vertebrate animal is to kill it; and to kill the symbolical serpent means to destroy the entire power of evil."

On the Greek words for *proof* I have nothing to add to the excellent letter of "B." in the PULPIT of the 29th.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, December 2nd, 1889.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Aston, Rev. Dr., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Cropper-lane, Bradford; Rector of Linton, near Skipton.
Bennett, Rev. Theophilus, M.A., Chaplain of Ospedaletti, near San Remo, Italy.
Birch, Rev. James Alexander Gordon, Vicar of Kirk Hamerton, York.

Blake, Rev. Frederick Hooper Aldrich, M.A., Vicar of Bishopswood.
Brodie, Rev. F. M., B.A., Rector of Honiley, Warwickshire.
Butcher, Rev. William E., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Cordelia*.
Carpenter, Rev. George Thomas, B.A., L.Th., Curate of Heigham; Curate-in-Charge of Thwaite, Stonham, Suffolk.
Cartwright, Rev. Edward Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Battersea.
Cook, Rev. Henry Lucas, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Low Moor, Bradford; Rector of Skipton, Yorkshire.
Cooke, Rev. A. H., M.A., Rector of Trevalga, Boscastle; Vicar of Davidstow, Cornwall.
Davies, Rev. John Jones, Curate of St. David's Welsh Church, Liverpool; Vicar of Dylife, Llanbrynmair, Montgomeryshire.
Fielding, Rev. C. H., M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Eltham-road; Chaplain of West Malling Union.
George, Rev. John, Vicar of Nerquis, Flintshire.
Griffith, Rev. Charles Bodvel, M.A., Rector of Bishopstone, Hereford.
Harper, Rev. Henry B., Chaplain to the *Hercules*.
Henry, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Challock, Kent.
Hughes, Rev. Charles Roydon Worsley, M.A., Rector of Long Ditton, Surrey.
Ingle, Rev. George Henry Nathaniel, B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Chapel of Ease of St. Gabriel, in the Parish of St. Mary's, Newington.
Machpherson, Rev. A. Cluny, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
Mitchell, Rev. St. John F., M.A., Chaplain at Calais; Permanent Chaplain at Neuchâtel.
Patrick, Rev. T., M.A., Chaplain of the Mersey Mission to Seamen; Vicar of St. Silas's, Pembroke-place, Liverpool.
Piggott, Rev. Charles Henry, Perpetual Curate of Chapel-hill, Tintern, Monmouthshire.
Rice-Jones, Rev. David, M.A., Curate of St. Giles-in-the-Fields; Rector of Stambourne, Essex.
Ross, Rev. Herbert, Vicar of St. Mark's, Manningham.
Seaton, Rev. J. A., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Cleckheaton; Rural Dean of Birstall.
Sharp, Rev. Harry James, B.A., Vicar of St. Hilda's, Leeds.
Trehearne, Rev. George H., Chaplain to the *Benbow*.
Vane, Rev. G. H. F., M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Eaton-square; Vicar of High Escall, Salop.
Wells, Rev. N. A., Curate of St. Edmund's, Salisbury; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Frome.
Whitaker, Rev. C. P., M.A., Senior Diocesan Inspector of Schools; Rector of High Bray, North Devon.
Williams, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Vicar of St. Martin's, Salop.
Wilkins, Rev. H. R., Curate of St. John's, Clifton; Rector of Oldbury-on-Severn.
Willoughby, Rev. Hugh St. Maur, B.A., Chaplain of the South Metropolitan Cemetery, Norwood.
Wood, Rev. Robert Alfred, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Under River, Kent.
Wright, Rev. Alban H., M.A., Tutor at Codrington College, Barbados; Organising Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for the Dioceses of Ely and Peterborough.
Wright, Rev. William, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Macclesfield Forest-with-Wildboar-Clough, Cheshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beauchamp, Rev. George C. P., at Petersham, on the 26th ult., aged 64.
Cuthbertson, Rev. Francis, LL.D., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Second Master of the City of London School, on Advent Sunday, suddenly, at St. Augustine's Church, Highbury New Park, aged 56.
Hunt, Rev. Augustus Archer, for forty-four years Vicar of the parish, at Tipton Parsonage, Ottery St. Mary, on the 26th ult., aged 69.
Roberts, Rev. Charles N., M.A., of St. John's College, Chaplain and Precentor of Christ Church, on St. Andrew's Day, at East View, Parks, Oxford, aged 55.
Williams, Rev. W., at the Rectory, Bedwas, near Cardiff, on the 26th ult., aged 68.



The Church of England Pulpit.

CHARITY SERMON.

BY THE REV. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER,
M.A., LL.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PETER'S CHURCH, DUBLIN, ON SUNDAY MORNING, JULY 28TH, 1889,
ON BEHALF OF THE PROTESTANT ORPHAN SOCIETY.

"But think on me when it shall be well with thee, and show kindness, I pray thee, unto me. . . Yet did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgot him." — GENESIS xl. 14-23.

YOU all know the story, the beautiful and touching life-story, of Joseph, the son of Jacob. That story contains many different and singular episodes. His coat of many colours in youth seems a fit and curious omen of his life of many characters played in manhood. In all these characters, Joseph, whether in persecution or in prosperity, figures equally nobly in his admirable simplicity and in his prideless dignity. These choice gifts of grace, true simplicity, and the humility which exalteth a man, enabled him in all the varied vicissitudes of his career to achieve that most difficult of all parts, even the hero's part of self-conquest. Joseph was the hero of self-conquest, for God trained him to conquer his faults. In his career he met with great trials, and had responsibilities as great thrust upon him. Now, trials and responsibilities compose a sovereign specific for the cure of certain spiritual infirmities, and are a special remedy for such moral symptoms as Joseph seems to have been affected with in his early youth—the infirmities of boastfulness and heedlessness. Boastfulness and heedlessness are faults peculiarly amiss in one appointed to rule; because sycophants play upon those weaknesses in order to divert the will of the ruler into acquiescence with their preconcerted machinations, and thus he who should rule becomes the slave of misrule. God Himself prescribed trials and responsibilities to cure Joseph of these infirmities; his trials wrought in him patience, and patience healed him of his heedlessness; humiliation cured him of boastfulness, and made this magnanimous soul fit for the high responsibility of rulership his God designed him to sway. And Joseph entering Egypt, the bought-and-sold bondchild of the Ishmaelites, became, in course of time, so changed from the imprudent and boastful stripling, the favourite and indulged son of Jacob and Rachel,

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 723.

that it would have taken a very astute discernor of human character indeed to espy the least trace of his youthful failings in Joseph, the prudent and humble-minded but premier functionary of Pharaoh, King of Egypt.

The particular episode in the life of this son of Israel giving rise to the words of our text—"Think on me when it shall be well with thee, and show kindness, I pray thee, unto me," saw him a prisoner in the ward-house of the captain of the guard in Egypt—a prisoner in authority, however, a good-conduct prisoner. For, by the mercy of Him whose mercy delights in befriending those unmercifully dealt with of men, Joseph had found favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison, who committed to him the oversight of all his fellow-prisoners, fellows with him in misery, if not in innocence. Merciful and magnanimous it was Joseph's nature to be when in prosperity, and so the Lord saw fit to be with him even in the disgrace and adversity of a prison-house, and grant him some measure of prosperity and even honour. Yet, it is evident he was not personally happy in prison; nor could happiness be compatible with his position, nor even contentment, because he lay in ward under a false accusation; and no man of principle, conscious of innocence, could be happy when stigmatised by the injustice of undeserved accusation and misapplied punishment.

Now it may occur to your mind to put the question, What connection has a theme drawn from the old-world life of Joseph, with the consideration of the lot and needs of the Protestant orphans of this our land? Well, his lot, his misfortunes, if considered closely, bear a telling resemblance, a historical analogy, to the general position of the orphan in all times. It was his lot before he was bartered away by his brethren into Egypt to be orphaned of his mother. She had died in giving birth to his brother Benjamin, his only full brother. His father Jacob, on the representation of his other children, Joseph's jealous-minded half-brethren, believed him to have been devoured of some wild animal, and mourned for his son many days, saying, "I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning." He believed that his best-beloved son was the prisoner of the grave at the very time when he was in truth a living prisoner among the Egyptians. So, as he was suppositionally held to be dead by his father, his father was practically dead to him. Joseph in Egypt, without relation, friend, or recommendation, was an orphan of the orphans, and an orphan among foreigners; and God provided for him as He designs the friendless orphan to be provided for—namely, by the hand and kindness of the stranger. And thus designing, He inspired Joseph with power to win his way among strangers, and so in His providence arranged the circumstances of his misfortunes, as to open opportunities for him to extricate himself from their entanglement.

I pause here to probe the source of his early acquaintance with misfortune. Dowered of God from his youth with superiority of genius over his brethren—gift of sway prognosticated to him in the ardent dreams of youth,—the sheaves of corn making obeisance to his sheaf, and the sun, moon, and stars (clusters of light sheaved on the field of heaven) paying him like reverence,—his jealous-minded brethren set themselves up as revolutionists against God's decree that their brother Joseph should bear rulership over them. So, fraternal jealousy entombed him alive in the pit at Dothan; so the same vice, cruel as the grave, left him to linger dead in the tomb of misrepresentation to their aged father—left that father to think without a doubt Joseph was rent in pieces of some evil beast. Alas! the truth was, he was consumed of the fierce brute of their fraternal jealousy. Oh! brutality of jealousy, that could leave a parent needlessly to cry in agony for a beloved son, "I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning." But the jealous-minded fraternity forgot that God's eye directs the execution of His every decree; and that for Joseph, their brother, His decree was that the pathway of servitude should be the roadway to rule, even to the prestige of vice-royal authority.

Now in the ward-house of Pharaoh's captain of the guard, see how God so ordered the incident of Joseph having for a fellow-prisoner the chief cup-bearer of a monarch, that it paved the way with smooth opportunities for His servant to attain freedom, favour, and power at the right hand of Egypt's throne. Joseph is ordained of God to be the prophet of good news to this disgraced courtier, and having assured him of his speedy recall to official honour, he pleads with him—"Think on me when it shall be well with thee, and show kindness, I pray thee, unto me,"—and points his plea for kindness by the relation of the story of his distress and wrong, saying—"For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews, and here also have I done nothing that they should put me into this dungeon."

Every orphan, my brethren, has, like Joseph, a story of woe, and, like him, superadded a story of wrong. It is an imitation of God to right the wrong and aid the helpless—"Be ye imitators of God as dear children." Be it yours, then, this day, according as God would wish you—and wish you He does—to be, as it were, sponsor-parents to these poor Protestant orphans for whom I plead, and by your substantial aid right their wrong, whatever that wrong may be.

But although Joseph appealed so earnestly to the chief cup-bearer, to whom he had just rendered invaluable service by the interpretation of his dream, the text says—"Yet did not the chief butler remember Joseph, but forgot him." The cup-bearer was an old courtier, and old courtiers have curt memories. Courtiers, and men in autho-

rity, as a rule, are willing enough to feed you with promises, fattening you on hope, to deplete you with disappointment. Furthermore, it is not the first time that one in adversity like Joseph, unable to help himself, has been able to render great service and afford tenderest consolation to a fellow-being; and equally it is not the first time that a person in misfortune, like this chief cup-bearer, has been glad to accept the friendly assistance and sympathy of another, yet in the callousness of after prosperity has forgotten thanklessly the benefit bestower. Oh! many a thankful beggar in adversity is but a sorry, ungrateful almoner in prosperity. Many, like the Egyptian courtier, believe with the most devout fervour the world's maxim, "It is more blessed to receive than to give," while they coldly neglect the saying of the Lord Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." However, to do the cup-bearer justice, it must be admitted that about two years after his release from imprisonment, circumstances, and the self-interest so characteristic of a courtier, made him recall to mind Joseph forgotten, and to quote his own penitent expression, "Remember his faults." And, my brethren, let us do ourselves justice, if ours has been in the past the fault of this courtier, who in his prosperity forgot the orphan, let us, as he did remember now our fault, and no longer forget, but remember to-day the plea of the orphan—"Think on me, and show kindness, I pray thee, unto me."

I said circumstances called Joseph to memory in the mind of the chief cup-bearer—circumstances—for God has no short memory. He remembered him, and caused events to marshal themselves on the side of right, and do battle for the deliverance of this Hebrew orphan, the victim of jealousy, false accusation, and unjust incarceration. What if Pharaoh's cup-bearer, restored to rank and influence, remembered him not, but forgot the orphan prisoner languishing in the gloom of the Egyptian dungeon. God's mercy and memory failed not. The Lord's ear heard his anxious prayer for help, and the Lord's eye watched and controlled the evolution of circumstances in the life drama of one precious in His sight. Truly "the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears are open unto their cry."

My brethren, speaking subjectively and with all reverence, foreplanning is God's method of thinking. Talk of chance as you will, talk of fortuitous circumstances as you may, they are only misnomers for Providence and purpose; because looked at searchingly, all things can be traced to a foreplanning aim sighted by the eye of God, which taken with unerring certitude must reach its destined mark, the centre of all things, His Holy Will. His thoughts moved foreplanningly towards Joseph in the relation he was to sustain later on to his brethren, and to the whole famine-stricken population of Egypt, and God ordained that at the right

opportunity the orphan prisoner should be delivered, and become the deliverer from absolute starvation of his persecuting brethren, and the life sustainer of an empire throughout a seven years' famine. And Joseph, a man of principle, when his brethren stood starving and suppliant before him, and strangers in the land where he sat lord and governor, has the opportunity afforded him to carry out the principle involved in his own appeal, "Think on me when it shall be well with thee, and show kindness, I pray thee, unto me." Then, sweetly contrastive, shone his mercy towards them, and his gratitude to his God, with their cruel jealousy of him, and proud rebellion against the Divine decree that their brother should reign over them. Over them he reigned, indeed; but his rule was mercy and compassion, as he told them, passing by magnanimously their vindictive ostracism of him from his father's home—"God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives." And with a like intention, my brethren, foreplanningly, God sent us into the world before these destitute, helpless orphans—harmless suppliants for your bounty, not like Joseph's brethren, undeserving petitioners—in order that you might think on them when it is well with you, and show kindness unto them, and preserve them to our beloved, Scriptural faith, a posterity to fear him in this land.

Now, the immediate event which led to Joseph's liberation and exaltation—the special ray of Divine favour to him—was the remarkable double-dream of the kine, and the ears of corn, sent to Pharaoh. Pharaoh's disquietude at his dream roused from lethargy the conscience of the cup-bearer, and reminded his treacherous memory of his forgotten benefactor Joseph, the wonderful interpreter of dreams.

You all know that a photograph is frequently called a sun-picture, because the likeness is produced by the action of the sun. Pharaoh's dream I might call the photograph or sun-picture of God's decree that a famine was to come on the land. The picture was produced by the agency of God Himself, as the Sun, on the camera obscura of Pharaoh's heathen mind, in the mystic envelopment of a dream; and Joseph was the artist appointed to draw forth and display the picture, and expound its meaning. The remarkable double-dream picture of Pharaoh was designed to serve a double purpose, one of which was to have immediate accomplishment, while the other was sealed up to a deferred fulfilment. The dream, in its grand, general purpose, was sent for the relief of a nation from famine, but its immediate purpose was to relieve the affliction of an individual. With the necessity to make preparation against a nation's famine arrived the necessity for the liberation of Joseph, whom God had endowed in an extraordinary degree with a measure of His own attributes of foreseeing and foreplanning. So,

Pharaoh's necessity to have his dream interpreted was God's opportunity for raising Joseph from the abasement of a prison to the grand-viziership of an empire; so, Joseph's necessity to be quit of the dungeon was God's opportunity to enlarge him, that he might deliver from destruction by famine a multitudinous population like Egypt's, and neighbouring nations depending upon her for the bounties of life. This double dream, sent to work a double mercy, goes to prove that "all things are double one against another." And perhaps the reason for this inter-doubling of all things in human affairs is, because the Universal Ruler has pleasure in and is wont to mind little affairs as well as great ones; because, speaking in the vocabulary of the creature about the incomprehensible Creator, He has regard to every unit creature He has made, as well as to collective systems of His universal creation; because He marketh the fall of the sparrow as well as the extinction of a world. And God, Who marketh the fall of the sparrow as well as the extinction of a world, marketh those who regard the orphans—orphans who are, as it were, the sparrows of His bounty.

Now, I have shown you how the Almighty, in ancient days, and among a heathen people, guarded and guided the destiny of a desolate orphan in such wise as that he obtained kindness, and highest obeisance to his gift of prescience and genius for government, from the mightiest monarch of that period of the world's history. To-day, God equally shelters in the broad embrace of His protecting wings these little ones—yes, even the feeblest one of them—whose natural guardians He has seen fit to remove; and these little ones He has conveyed to His Christian people as a temporary trust, to bear their temporal burdens until they shall be able to take upon them the yoke of life's labour for themselves. He has entrusted these orphans to the tender mercy of, not heathens, but people who profess to be the brethren of His Son Jesus Christ. If we are truly in brother-love with Christ, we shall not do as Joseph's unkind brethren did—deliver a single little one over to the Ishmaelites of proselytism in this land, who would sell that hapless soul alive into a spiritual Egypt of superstition and mental captivity. Our Elder Brother and Master, Christ, would not have us trust these orphans to worldly chance for a father, nor to fortuitous circumstance for a mother, but to living, kind-hearted men and women, who will think on them and show kindness unto them, and bring them up in the knowledge of God and His Word unto salvation. To ensure them such a training is the defined object sought to be accomplished by the Protestant Orphan Society, when it commits the orphans whom it supports to the care of worthy and self-respecting Protestant people, who attend faithfully to the children's bodily wants, and see that they are regular in attending the ministrations of the Church of Ireland in the

respective parishes in which they are placed to reside.

THE GOSPEL TO THE POOR: A SERMON FOR THE RICH.

BY THE REV. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
ENGLISH CHAPLAIN, GOTHENBURG.

SERMON PREACHED AT GOTHENBURG, ON 27TH
OCTOBER, 1889.

"The poor have the Gospel preached to them."—MATT.
xi. 7.

THIS was the crowning mercy of the mercies of Christ. This was the sign above all signs by which John Baptist should recognise the Heart of his Master.

For of old had this been looked forward to. Isaiah, speaking of the great outpouring of the Spirit's grace in the days to come, and exalting the minds of his fellows by exalting their hope of the Messiah of God, had spoken of this great token of the new kingdom—that the Saviour should preach the glad tidings to the lowly. And when Jesus first spoke in the Synagogue it was to just this prophecy he turned, reading from the ancient teacher the blessed promise which, said He, "is this day fulfilled in your ears": "the spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor."

So, too, when He had by speaking of the duty of repentance towards God won men's ears to listen to the hopes of that grace to which repentance would lead them, calling the repentant multitude about Him He proclaims the riches of the spiritual kingdom of God. And the first word of blessedness is a word for the poor, to be followed immediately by a like word for the mournful and the lowly, the hungry and needy. "Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God! Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven."

What then does it mean? Is there a Gospel to the poor preached by the Lord Himself which is some other than the Gospel preached to the rich? Or was there no Gospel preached to the rich? Or is it that the Lord was careless as to them and their needs, giving His whole heart to that mass of humanity usually so silent and forgotten, so misused and so abused—the poor? Or is it that though His Gospel was free and open to all men everywhere, yet He knew that it would be a reality only to the poor?

These are very awkward questions, friends—usually ignored by those who, like those here in this congregation, are by no means poor. They are nevertheless well worth attention, even on the part of the wealthy. There is an answer to be found to these and many other like questions suggested by this habit of the Christians'

Lord, of giving the very best of His Gospel only to the poor, the ignorant, the dreary, hard living, hard toiling multitude. Certainly it is very instructive and very startling to find that though the Lord spoke some words of comfort and guidance, and encouragement to every class of men, to help in every kind of perplexity, there was one subject (reckoned by us most perplexing) as to which He remained profoundly silent, if indeed not absolutely indifferent. He had a word for honest soldiers, for vulgar profligates, for thoughtful students, for mourning families; he had for the sick, health; for the sad, hope; for the weak, courage; for the poor, helpful counsel, most wonderfully helpful counsel, and blessed strength of brotherhood; but for the rich, for those burdened and perplexed by the responsibility of wealth—not a word! Well, let us be accurate. He did certainly express His mind frankly, more than once; He had a word to say; but we have for the greater part of these eighteen centuries very generally agreed to persuade ourselves that He did not mean what He said then. For there is but cold comfort in it.

Now, my friends, here is a matter worthy of attention. I have simply stated a few of the endless difficulties raised by our Lord's attitude in this matter. I state the questions; I am neither going to explain them away nor offer any crude solutions of them. The only answers worth listening to are those answers which you may each find for himself by taking frankly the Gospel as it is. I do venture to say this much however, that I think I see in my Lord's Gospel some answer to every one of them; but I intend to let them plead for themselves without my advocacy—to-day, at any rate.

But yet we must ask: Is the Gospel for the poor quite other than the Gospel for the rich? This at least can be answered, if only partially, at once. The Gospel is the message of God to *man*, not to *classes of men*. To the richest of Oriental princes, as to the slave washing his feet (who may call scarce his soul and assuredly not his body his own), when these two men stand up as men for whom the Lord God has a message, to both of them, being men, is the Gospel fit to be preached.

For if we are to say, wresting the Lord's words, that the Gospel is offered only to the poor (and that He never says), then we are involved in a subtle discussion as to what is the line of demarcation. And these subtle discussions are absolutely opposed to the spirit of Christ.

There is this much obvious at once. It is a Gospel to the poor, inasmuch as none but those who recognise some want in themselves will even so much as listen to it. And it is a Gospel to the poor (in the ordinary and literal sense) inasmuch as it is a *giving of the power of increased life*. What is the one sole advantage which riches give?—an advantage so great, let us frankly allow, that it cannot be at all wondered at that men are

anxious to secure the chance of it: though alas, so few, even of the successful, know how to use it. It is the advantage of *being able to command a wider experience of life*. Therefore, the using of riches can be, and often is, noble and good; although it brings always certain inevitable difficulties in its train. This power of commanding a wide experience of the various forms of life may be found, says the Author of Life, in other ways than by the usual way of wealth. The blessing of the poor is the giving of the kingdom of God; the life which Christ Jesus lays open to their sight is the life eternal—the life drawn consciously from God Himself. And this Gospel of the power of God making life within the man is open to all men who will learn of Christ.

The gift of the world to its rich men is to increase life by giving command of the *means* of life *without*. The gift of Christ to His poor is to increase life by giving increased command of the *power* of life *within*—"the kingdom of God is yours," "the kingdom of God is within you." Obviously this is a more marvellous and acceptable gift to the poor than to the rich. It takes the rich much longer to discern—in fact, too often they never discover—that there is after all a very vast difference between having the means of life and having life: the life of a calm, true, open-hearted man, whose mind is not tossed and turned by the insignificant ripples of the waves of time, but can look on steadfastly, and reach out bravely to the endless life in the presence of God, strong in all that is best worth having of knowledge and truth, and grace, and love. True life is developed in the man by the power of all the forces without him. Thus Christ's Gospel, though offered freely to all men is yet a Gospel to the poor, forasmuch as its power gives them a grace they too often lack; and forasmuch also as when it is a Gospel believed in by the rich, yet it is only intelligible to them when they take it confessing that they have failed from the world to draw the power of life their hearts need. They come as poor in spirit, else never is the Gospel a "glad tidings" to them: they do not understand it. And this is just a point where we see light clearer. For there is no denying that the power of life offered by the world stands ever in competition with that offered by the Lord Jesus Christ. So that the power given by the one blinds the eyes to the power which may be given by the other. Those who seek Christ's power must choose it; and choice means a taking of one thing and leaving of another. The world-spirit and the Christ-spirit view life differently.

But there is one way in which we may all alike hear the Gospel to the poor as those who may rightfully claim it. "Naked we came into the world, and naked we shall leave it." Naked in the sight of God stands the heart of the mightiest and highest. "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth." No! but

in the stamp and shape he takes from these things: the man is the soul within these possessions. And for spiritual power, for grace to love the good and hate the evil; for the gift of peace and the love of God; for the righteousness and the wholeness of heart which we must have to satisfy our own hungry souls—where shall we find them if we are not ready to humble ourselves, and come as truly poor, to the throne of God, and hear from the lips of Him "Who had not where to lay His head" the words of grace preached first and foremost to those who, like Himself, were poor, and thereafter to all who hearing of the riches of His grace know themselves to be, without this, poor indeed.

So the Gospel is a Gospel to the poor because it is a Gospel to the man; and the poor understand it best because the man is less encumbered in his case with false consolation and deceptive means of power and life. It is commonly asserted that the "masses" have lapsed, fallen away from Christianity. That they have fallen away from the Churches, there is, alas! no denying whatever. But that is the Churches' fault. They so easily forget to preach the Gospel of the poor. Yet it is a grave question whether after all it is not just among these "lapsed masses," that some of the fundamental truths of Christ's religion are best understood.

But there is still a further point open to us, here—very few of whom dare claim the poor man's privileges.

There is, indeed, a poverty, which none can think either blessed or specially capable of blessing—that which results from evil living. That is the most miserable surely of all states, where a man having foolishly and madly cut himself off from the powers and consolations which the world affords, has yet not gained the graces and strength of the spirit of God. So again it seems to me that there may be something of the power of hearing this Gospel to the poor aright, for those who, like St. Paul, "counting all things but loss that they may win Christ," voluntarily and freely lessen their hold on the gains of the world that they may be the more free to appreciate and appropriate the riches of the kingdom of spiritual power. So far as they refuse to draw the joy or the power, the grace or the consolation, the stay or the inspiration of their life from that which riches offer, and seek it rather, as among God's needy ones, from Him who preached His Gospel first, even if not altogether to the poor; so far as they "leave all to follow Him," so far do they, too, have a part in this Word of the Lord spoken to "the poor in spirit" as well as to the poor in pelf. For this surely is the human Gospel, that as we learn to sit loosely to the things of the flesh, so do we learn to sit more securely "in the heavenly places" with Christ Jesus. So far as we in heart enter into the conditions which called forth the helpful sympathy of

the Saviour, so far are we capable of appreciating the sympathy and help He gives. Few believe this. There are those who do. The report they give us of the benefits of this faith are very striking, very striking indeed.

But we have spoken of the life which men will, by one means or other, either by aid of mammon or by aid of Christ, seek to draw to themselves. Yet, if the Life appeals to us as *men*, whether rich men or poor men, how much more does Death. Christ's Gospel is undoubtedly a great leveller. It speaks to all men as but one in nature—sinners who may be saints; sons of God, whether princes or peasants; sons of God who have somehow sadly lost trace of sonship, but may be redeemed by the Saviour's love and grace. But of all things death is supreme as a leveller of men. Then, indeed, is the richest poor, when not the wealth of India will give breath to those straining lungs, or sight to those failing eyes; when all that luxury or art or skill can devise is "the cup of cold water," which even the roadside beggar can always with confidence demand in the name of his humanity. In death we are poor indeed. Let the poor man's Gospel, the word of hope and the promise of life be ours, for it will be of avail at just that most needful time when "all that a man hath will he give for his life." He, "who for your sakes became poor that ye through His poverty might be made rich," will give you "without money and without price," "gold tried in the fire, and white raiment that ye may be clothed, and that the shame of your nakedness do not appear" in the day when only true riches will secure the comfort of life.

And if death brings all men to an equally low level, so assuredly will the Resurrection raise all to one common equal glory. For even though one may exceed another in the glory of the new life, that excess of glory is nought but excess of meekness and lowliness. The "poor in spirit" are there made the rich in grace. As the soul has purged itself of the pride and self-esteem and self-sufficiency of the world, and come to be filled and clothed with the grace of life given to the lowly soul by God, so has it been entering into "the power of the resurrection." The fellowship with Christ in the resurrection is the *fulfilment* of that Gospel which preached to the poor and by the poor, yet "makes many rich."

Thus, then let it stand. The Gospel begins at the lowest; it appeals to us as men and women, not as men and women *plus* somewhat else; not to the man as of power and wealth, not to the man as of skill and talent; not to the man as of refinement and education, but to the human heart which beats with the pulse of God-given life equally under the ragged livery of the slave and the purple livery of the monarch; it is for the man Christ pleads, to the man He speaks; for the man He died. His are they who will humble themselves to His fellowship; by that to be exalted as to the actual life of

them. May it be ours to know the full riches of this grace. The life is more than meat, and the body than raiment. And most assuredly as we see and know the power of that life so shall we be the less moved and distracted by the fluctuations in the forms of life.

CHRISTIAN CONDUCT.

BY REV. JOHN W. KAYE, RECTOR.

SERMON PREACHED IN DERRYBRUSK PARISH CHURCH ON THE 20TH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

"Look, therefore, carefully how ye walk, not as unwise, but as wise; redeeming the time because the days are evil. Wherefore be ye not foolish, but understanding what the will of the Lord is."—EPHES. v. 15-16 (Revised Version).

WHEREVER the pure and spiritual truth of Christianity was preached by the Apostles, and received into the understandings and the hearts of men, conflicts and oppositions immediately followed. On the one hand it met with Judaism, which had been reduced to a system of ceremonialism, puerile observances, and traditional formalism, to the neglect of the weightier matters of the law, viz., judgment, mercy, and faith. On the other hand, it met with an impure but beautiful mythology, which had its origin far back in the forgotten ages of Grecian fable or Eastern legend. The idolatrous licentiousness of Baal and Ashtaroath clothed itself with beauty and revelled in the groves of Athens and in the vanity fairs of Ephesus. Ionian voluptuousness found its fullest development under that tutelary goddess, Diana or Artemis, "whom all Asia and the world worshipped." With these two prevailing forms of religion, Judaism and Pagan mythology, Christianity had its greatest conflicts. The Pharisees clung with a fanatical pertinacity to their oral law, their broad phylacteries, and their elaborate ritual, and persecuted to the death the followers of the crucified Nazarene. The Gentiles, steeped in sensuality, yet boasting of their Greek and Roman culture, scoffed at the teachings of Christianity and denounced the worshippers of Christ, the crucified Jew, as fanatics and rebels. And when the Christians came not with their gifts and votive offerings to the pagan temples, the priests and the excited populace ran upon them with frenzy, crying, "The Christians to the lions!" Such were the perils of those first believers in the Lord Jesus Christ. For two years St. Paul had laboured, preaching and teaching the truth of the Gospel at Ephesus, even at the peril of his own life, and had formed a small church there. He left them when he escaped from the mob excited by Demetrius, the silversmith. During his absence false teachers had crept into the churches at Colossæ and Ephesus, and from his bondage at Rome he wrote

not only his letter to the Colossians, but this (probably) circular Epistle to the Ephesians. Our text contains remarkable words for the guidance of these Asian Christians, which apply equally to ourselves. The Apostle urges—

I. WATCHFULNESS OF WALK.—“Look, therefore, carefully how ye walk ; not as unwise, but as wise !” We can well understand the necessity of a watchful walk among the early Christians ; hated by bigoted Jews, despised and suspected by unscrupulous Gentiles. Many of the early converts were slaves, or belonged to the poorest class of the people. Their previous life had been mixed up with the licentiousness of the age, “wherein in time past they walked according to the course of this world.” And we can see how easy it would be for such men to backslide and revert into their old sinful habits. Before them were the continual temple festivals, garlanded deities, bridal processions, mirthful dances, and torchlight revelries. But Christianity—the new religion they were called upon to adopt—enforced the strictest morality and the sacrifice of worldly pleasures ; it subjected them to ridicule and bitter persecution ; pointed them to a King who was crucified, and whose crown was a crown of thorns. We can see how hard it would be for these poor converts, in the midst of daily temptations, to continue faithful, and “walk worthy of the vocation with which they were called.” No wonder, then, that the Apostle should write so anxiously, that they should walk carefully and circumspectly as wise men. He knew their weakness and the dangers that surrounded them ; he warned them against immorality, false doctrine, cunning craftiness, and vain ceremonialism.

How necessary is watchfulness, that no false allurements should steal upon us unawares and lead us astray. “If the good man of the house had known in what hour the thief would come he would have watched” ; hence the Lord says : “What I say unto you, I say unto all : Watch !” Watchfulness is necessary to consistency of Christian character ; that harmony of action with principle, of profession with practice, which results from a beautiful and living union of true Christian graces. Many a man has failed because he neglected one point, and watched not, thinking there was no danger ; and many a city has been stormed and taken because the citizens guarded not the weak places and slumbered when they should have watched. As Christians, let us watch carefully our daily walk, and with prayerfulness let us lean on Him in Whom is everlasting strength. In God alone shall we find grace to help in every time of need. Again, the Apostle urges—

II. PROMPTNESS OF PURPOSE.—“Redeeming the time because the days are evil.” Times and opportunities do not wait for men ; they must be seized, bought, redeemed, when they present themselves ; for when once they are past, they are often past for ever. We can never again call back the

days of our youth ; the glorious privileges and the golden opportunities they gave us are gone—gone, and perhaps eternally lost ! Ephesus was the great trading city of Proconsular Asia, where the merchants both of the east and west assembled for commerce watching for opportunities to buy and sell and get gain. The Asian Christians were well acquainted with these things, and the words of St. Paul would come to them with great power, fitness and cogency. As the merchantmen watched and seized every opportunity for buying or selling their commodities, so must the Christians seize and buy up every opportunity for manifesting their true Christian character, and making known “the truth as it is in Jesus.” The time past surely sufficed them having worked the works of wickedness ; and now they must be no longer partakers with the wicked. “For ye were sometimes darkness, but now light in the Lord ; therefore, walk as children of the light” (Ephes. v. 8).

Watchfulness is necessary for promptness of purpose ; for redeeming the time. The great temptation to many is to put off, and still to put off with good intention. But the Christian has no time to waste in frivolities, and in those things which profit us nothing. The wavering and undecided have no time to lose, “for we know neither the day nor the hour when the Son of man cometh.” The call of God our Saviour is, “Come now and let us reason together.” Alas ! it seems as if men now-a-days were striving to solve the problem—“With how little religion may a man be saved.” St. Peter prayed for the saints, not a bare entrance into the Kingdom of God, but that “an entrance should be ministered unto them abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (2 Peter i. 11). Let us therefore buy up the opportunities, because the days are evil. “The days are evil” because the days are so few, so transient, and so filled with sinful allurements and temptation to forget God. Hostile circumstances and the powers of darkness beset us on every hand ; therefore let us lose no opportunities, but with promptness and full purpose of heart, let us “walk as children of the light.” One other point which St. Paul urges in our text is—

III. DISCERNMENT OF DUTY.—“Wherefore, be ye not foolish but understanding what the will of the Lord is.” Those Asian converts who had before-time followed every impulse of their own unregenerate minds are now called upon to walk according to the will of God. But what a request for the Apostle to make of those whose “understandings had been darkened and who were alienated from the life of God, because of their ignorance and the hardness of their hearts.” Yet it was no strange or outrageous request. For their hearts had been changed by the power of the Gospel preached by the Apostle, and that Gospel had proved the power of God unto their salvation. Once “they were darkness, but now they are light

in the Lord." For "the fruit of the Spirit of Light is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth." The light of the Spirit had shone into their dark hearts and illumined them with the rays of divine truth. They had heard the voice saying, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (Isa. ix. 1, 2). But they needed yet further Christian development—they must "grow strong in the Lord and in the power of His might" (Ephes. vi. 10). They must yet "grow in grace," and in the true discernment of their duty, "understanding what the will of the Lord is." There must be a close and loving walk with God, for it is only to such that He graciously reveals His power and glory. The faculty to discern the will of God must itself be illumined by divine life. The "spirit of discernment" must be brought into daily exercise in searching our own hearts, and in dealing with our fellow-men. Rightly to understand what is God's will concerning us, we must draw near to God in faith and prayer and love. God makes known to us His will in the teachings of His written word, by the guidance of His Holy Spirit, and in the dispensations of His providence. It is for us to be wise in the discernment of our duty, listening to the monitions of the Spirit, hearkening to the voice of His word, and giving ourselves wholly to God. "The will of God," said the Apostle, "is our sanctification"; not only our redemption, but, our transformation, by the renewing of our minds, that we may be like Christ, and in glory behold Him as He is. There is rapture in the thought that we may be with Him where He is; that we may behold His glory; that we may be like Him. The trials and the sufferings of the present life are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed hereafter." "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

—♦—

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PAMPHLET
and Advice
FREE

Every man and woman in search of **HEALTH** should write without delay to **MR. C. B. HARNESS**, Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "**Harness' Guide to Health**," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harness' Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. **MR. C. B. HARNESS** also gives Advice (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1889.

JEWISH CONVERTS IN TROUBLE.

"HEBREW Christians in trouble" is the heading of a circular which has been placed in our hands, and which appeals for the support of nine Hebrew Christians whom it is asserted have been wrongfully dismissed from the Jewish Operative Institution at Palestine Place.

These young men say that they had for a long time been experiencing many petty annoyances, which culminated in the events resulting in an open rupture; whilst the principal (a clergyman of the Established Church) retorts by accusing many outsiders of having goaded on these young men to such insubordination. Whoever be in fault it must be a source of real sorrow to all true Christians to hear of such events. This institution exists solely for the purpose of supporting young Jewish converts whose open confession of Christ by Baptism has brought upon them both disgrace and poverty. Here many a young man has been sheltered and taught a trade, and not a few men of high position can claim this Institution as the home of their youth. Those Jews who are most antagonistic to the progress of Christianity among their brethren are only too glad to take advantage of such events; to point the finger of scorn at any Christianising agency, and nothing could be more opportune to these men than this case in which they will no doubt assert that the newly-baptised Jew is an object of scorn to Christians as well as Jews; nor can we deny that *primâ facie* it would appear as if it were so, in the case of these young men at least; but we must not lose sight of another very important element in the case, an element which must considerably modify the opinion of

those who interest themselves in this matter. At all times the amount of independent spirit prevalent among young Jews is considerable, but when these young men, as in the present case, have never (or at least not for years) experienced even parental control, it is not surprising that a spirit of insubordination should be prevalent among them. This, we are informed, would have been coped with, but among other influences a party spirit seems to have been underlying much of the trouble.

It is asserted that there are many who are exceedingly inimical to the principal, and that they have fomented a feeling of animosity among the inmates. Whether this be the case or not we cannot say, but it seems to us that there have been faults on both sides, and we cannot too earnestly regret what has occurred at Palestine Place. The matter is still *sub judice*. It would therefore be unwise to prophesy, but we shall gladly welcome any arrangement that would tend to put a stop to these scandals.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." December, 1889. London : Hodder and Stoughton.

WE were very glad to see the promised continuation of Dr. Jessop's paper on "Primitive Liturgies and Confessions of Faith." It is extremely interesting. He conjectures that the well-known interpolation in the account of the Baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 36) has really the same origin as the quotation in Rom. x. 5, which he paraphrases thus : "Say not in thy heart, Who shall go up to heaven? *i.e.*, to bring Christ down, nor, Who shall go down into the abyss? *i.e.*, to bring Christ up from the dead; but *what does it say?* The phrase is near thee *in thy mouth and thy memory*, that is the phrase of the faith, which phrase we proclaim (*τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστewς ὃ κηρύσσομεν*) saying (*ᾠρῶ* recitative)"; and then follows a quotation (according to Dr. Jessopp) from a Christian confession, not indeed in the same words as in the *Textus ab omnibus Rejectus* (to use Canon Jessop's expression), but as given in the Laudian MS., a MS. of great value, in words that have many striking coincidences. Now, this conjecture may perhaps to some seem a little too clever, but it is well worth attention. Again, amongst doubtful passages he instances Jas. i. 19, reading (with Westcott and Hort) *ἵστε* for *ᾠστε*, and omitting the *δε*. We think he might have been less doubtful; the second part of the verse seems to us almost certainly a quotation. And if we had space we should gladly notice other interesting passages.

Principal David Brown, D.D., does not approve of Dr. Milligan's book on the Apocalypse. His theory, says Dr. Brown, "will never do"—rather an unlucky phrase, when we remember that a very famous criticism began with those words and had afterwards to be retracted. But the reason why Dr. Milligan's theory "will never do" is, because, if the Apocalypse only teaches "principles," and does not predict facts, then it teaches them "obscurely," while other parts of Scripture teach the same principles clearly. This is Philistinism rampant. A chemist might just as well

say that, considering there are so many scientific treatises on death and its effects, *In Memoriam* "will never do." It is strange how many cannot see that there are certain aspects of truth which can only be taught in a poetic form.

Mr. Hoskier goes into raptures over the exact photographic reproduction of Codex B. Mortals who are not millionaires may take comfort by thinking that if anything new is found, and which is worth the telling, it will soon be told. And—we say it with bated breath—it is just possible to exaggerate the value of Codex B.

Professor Cheyne writes on the 24th Psalm, and Professor Bruce on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MISCONCEPTIONS.

Sir,—I observe statements in the two last numbers of the PULPIT, which, to my mind, indicate misconceptions on important points. One is, that if *αἰώνιος* has been employed to mean endless, "there is nothing to prevent us from using it in that sense in Matt. xxv. 46." Another statement is : "There is no text which, when fairly interpreted, lends any countenance to the notion that the punishment of the wicked will come to an end."

Here is a text, which, to my mind, clearly shows that the punishment of the wicked will not be endless : Col. i. 20 : "Having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things to Himself." The term *all things* evidently includes created beings of every order, and not the human race alone. In regard to the latter, the Saviour said : "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Then we have Eph. i. "Gather together all things in Christ;" and 1 Cor. xv. 28, "That God may be all in all." This, as Chrysostom remarks, will be when sin no longer exists. I may add 1 Cor. xv. 22 "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." If they are made alive in Christ, it will be for an object beneficial to themselves, and not that they may be able to endure endless miseries. Heb. ii. 9, "Taste death for every man." If that was and is His purpose, that purpose will be fulfilled. I fully agree with a relation of my own, who is a Canon of the Church of England. He wrote to me ten days ago : "I sincerely honour every attempt to make the Divine Love triumphant over every obstacle, and I believe that in God's own way and time it will be so manifested before the whole of creation."

It is clear to me that the foregoing texts and others of the same gracious tendency ought to be carefully considered, when we endeavour to interpret passages relating to the punishment of sin.

One of your correspondents was quite shocked when I quoted a declaration of the late Bishop of Argyll to the effect that hell "is not endless, but the way to righteousness." Chrysostom had said the same thing, namely, "God is equally to be praised when He chastises, and when He frees from chastisement, for both spring from goodness." "It is right then to give thanks for Gehenna."

There is a remark in the PULPIT of last Saturday

which appears to me to indicate an almost incredible misconception. I quote the words: "Accepting the term *αἰώνιος* in the sense of age-long does not help the universalist a bit. How can it, when the age which succeeds this is never ending?" The universalists undoubtedly believe in an immortal never-ending existence. But they have the cheering, love inspiring conviction, that it is the clearly revealed purpose of God to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, holy and happy immortality through processes of a most momentous nature, which take place during *aions* or ages. I understand *age-long punishment* in that sense; and the fact that never-ending immortality succeeds after incalculable ages of preparatory instruction and discipline does not affect the question at all.

In our days wise and benevolent minds are desirous to combine the punishment of criminals with efforts for instruction and amelioration of character. We can all see that such efforts are in complete harmony with the teachings of the New Testament. Why can we not see that God is acting on the same principles towards all His intelligent creatures? Why should we suppose it is His purpose to inflict endless ruin, when He has provided ample resources to transform the most perverse and evil?

J. B.

Canonbury, December 9th, 1889.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I very much dislike controverting with any one who has not the honesty and moral courage to write his name in full at the end of his letters. Anonymous correspondents put us so much in mind of a large class of people with whom we are already too familiar, that it is quite distasteful to have anything to do with them. "B.," in interfering in the controversy between me and Mr. Murphy is evidently, in his own opinion, a "Daniel come to judgment," but more accurately should I describe him as like the man in the Gospel, who, with eyesight partially restored, "saw men, as *trees*, walking." How unfortunate it is that, when he found fault with my definition of a demonstration, he did not show me how I was wrong. I thought I was safe in following Locke, who, on page 80, Vol. ii., of his work on the "Human Understanding," defines it, as I have done, by saying that the "intervening ideas which serve to show the agreement of any two others are called proofs, and where the agreement and disagreement is by this means plainly and clearly perceived it is called a demonstration." Perhaps "B.'s" reading has not made him acquainted with the work of this great man. Happy thought! Let him issue a corrected edition of Locke's work, and then, without doubt, he will obtain the fame at which he aspires by his attempts at smart writing. Archbishop Whately, in his "Lessons on Reasoning," tells us that "all these expressions—'giving a reason,' 'drawing a conclusion,' 'bringing forward an argument'—relate to one and the same process in the mind, that which is properly called 'reasoning.' And that the same may be said of several other expressions also, such as 'inferring' or 'drawing an inference,' 'proving a point,' 'establishing a conclusion,' 'refuting an argument,' etc. All these expressions, and some others besides, have reference to the process of reasoning." This is pre-

cisely what I meant when I spoke at different times of "evidence," "proof," and demonstration. They refer to the same mental operation, only viewed from *different stand-points*. J. S. Mill defines logic as the "science of *proof* or *evidence*," showing plainly that the "evidence" might be called the "proof," and the "proof" the "evidence," according to the object in view, or the mental attitude assumed at the time. If I am asked to "*prove*" the truth of the assertion that the duration of the punishment of the wicked will be endless, I refer to Matt. xxv. 46; if I am asked on what "*evidence*" I believe the same proposition to be true, I point to the same text; and if I were asked how I would "*demonstrate*" the truth of that doctrine, I would throw it into a syllogism, thus: All God's declarations are true; one of His declarations is that the future punishment of the wicked will be endless; therefore, that the future punishment of the wicked will be endless is a true doctrine. Now, where am I wrong in all this? Where is the flaw in the argument? Where is the invalidity of the syllogism? Have I not built my conclusion on the *evidence* of a "fact," the fact that that conclusion is contained in a text of Scripture? And have I not *proved* my conclusion by that "fact"? Why am I wrong in calling that syllogism a "demonstration"? I am not wrong, if Locke's definition of a "demonstration" be correct. Do we not here perceive the agreement of two ideas by the intervention of a third? Am I wrong in calling a *single* syllogism a demonstration? Mr. R. Potts, of Trinity College, Cambridge, in his "Euclid," says: "We may take the syllogism in the demonstration of Prop. 1, Book I," etc. Here the term is applied, as I have done it, to a single syllogism. Am I wrong in calling it a demonstration because the subject-matter involved is not a mathematical truth? Locke repudiates the notion that demonstration is confined to mathematics, and proceeds at once to demonstrate the existence of God. Can I not prove the truth of the two premisses by an appeal to facts of Scripture? No one will deny the major; about the meaning of the minor there is some dispute. I prove it to be true in every way by showing that the greatest absurdity the world has ever heard of will follow from supposing it to be false. I do it in this way: the smoke of the torment of the wicked is said to ascend up "*for ever and ever*" (Rev. xiv. 11); and God is said to live "*for ever and ever*" (Rev. iv. 9). Now, if the phrase "*for ever and ever*" in the first instance mean a limited time, it must mean the same in the second instance; then, if it mean a limited time in the second instance, it would follow that God would cease to be! Now I call it the greatest absurdity in the world to say a self-existent being would ever cease to exist, yet this is what comes from supposing the punishment of the wicked to be of a limited duration. Our two premisses, then, being perfectly true, and the conclusion following legitimately from them, why am I forbidden to call my syllogism a demonstration? Is it from the imaginary notion that there is not "mathematical certainty in it"? Mathematical demonstrations are no more certain than other demonstrations properly performed. This is Locke's opinion given above, and Mill says: "The *peculiar* accuracy, supposed to be characteristic of the first principles of geometry, appears to be *fictitious*." What greater certainty can we have for the truth of any fact than the declaration of God? What greater certainty can we have that a declaration has been made by God than the fact that it is contained in His Word? In short, what greater

certainly can we have that the punishment of the wicked will be endless than the statement made in Rev. xiv. 11? There never was greater certainty in any demonstration presented to the world. There can be no greater. No amount of perverse ingenuity nor oblique criticism can set aside this certainty. But let us return to "B.'s" letter. He speaks of a "conclusion derived from proof," and of proof being "built upon evidence," and of "evidence being a fact," which means that evidence is proof. Quite true; but why did he blame me for using those words in the same way? Mill speaks of the "evidence of demonstration"; and T. K. Abbott, F.T.C.D., in his "Logic," speaks of the conclusion as being "proved" by the premisses, which shows that in the mind of these excellent men evidence and proof perform the same function, namely, to establish the truth of the conclusion. If this be so, where will we find the "something between evidence and proof," which he defines *ἐλεγχος* to be? "Something." Surely this definition must furnish a rich repast for the amusement of your readers. I always thought that the definition should be clearer than the thing defined; but this is the reverse. Does he not perceive that this "something" is what we are in quest of? He says *ἐλεγχος* "has no English equivalent." Has it not? Who told him that? The Rev. J. Wesley, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, defined it as "evidence and conviction"; Dr. Clarke as the "conviction produced in the mind by the demonstration of a problem"; certain logicians as *demonstratio quæ fit argumentis certis et rationibus indubitalibus, quâ rei certitudo efficitur*; while Aristotle defines it thus: *Ἐλεγχος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ μὴ δυνατός ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ὡς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν*. "B.'s" remark that a "syllogism is not a demonstration nor a proof, but is the form into which a proof may be put," is the same as saying that a man is not a human being, though a human being is the form in which a man may be made. We speak of "deductive or demonstrative science"; and the syllogism, being deductive, must be demonstrative. Bishop Butler never wrote a work on Logic; what has he to do with all this? Nothing; except that "B." wishes to show that he has read him badly by introducing his name so irrelevantly. "B." says "I must think on entirely wrong lines if I imagine that everything that ought to be believed is susceptible of demonstration." How does he know what I imagine? I expect demonstration where demonstration can be had; probability where probability only can be had. But when I believe God, my faith is a demonstration (Heb. xi. 1).

The axioms of Euclid are not assumed because they cannot be demonstrated, but because they *need* no demonstration; they are self-evident. And they are believed to be true on the evidence of our intuitive consciousness. We build demonstration on intuition, not intuition on demonstration. When it is said that "this demonstration addresses itself to the mere animal understanding," but that it is "the peculiar and God-like faculty of *spiritual* understanding to be capable of seeing truths that could never be the subject of proof," it is asserted that man has *two* understandings—an animal and a spiritual one. We have got into the regions of mystical psychology now; this is something new for Reid, Spencer, Hamilton, and Maunsell! An animal understanding is an understanding that animals have; here is something new for the zoologist! To say that we can see truths that can never be the subject of proof is the same as saying that we can see things that could never be the proper

objects of vision. Why is the understanding so dark on spiritual things if we can see truths without proof? And why do we require to have the "eyes of our understanding *enlightened*"? It was not the influence of this God-like faculty which led "B." to say that "the conscience can be awakened independent of argument," since the Almighty said, "Come now and let us *reason* together." It was when Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, that Felix *trembled*"; and John gave as a reason why people should repent, that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." It is truly marvellous with what barefacedness people will make assertions which cannot be proved.

The word *δοῦλος* was a term applied to a person who had been deprived of his liberty by the superior physical power of another, and who was on that account compelled to do an unwilling service. Such an one was regarded as the property of his lord and master. Let us apply these ideas to Christ, and we shall see how utterly incongruous they are. Who ever deprived Him of His personal liberty so as to enslave Him? To whom did He ever perform an unwilling service as a slave? Was He ever the property of any one in this capacity? It is true He came to do the will of His Father; but then it was said, "I delight to do thy will, oh my God." And to say that the service He rendered to His Father while working out the scheme of human redemption was a bond-service is to belie Him. Apply the same ideas to St. Paul; he was never in bondage to any man. It is true he was Christ's property, but it was by a *voluntary* surrender of himself under the influence of God's grace; it is true he rendered service to Christ, but there was no *bondage* in it, because "he is a freeman whom the truth makes free." The Revisers use of the term is instructive. In some cases they translate it by servant, and in others by bond-servant; and sometimes, when they have servant in the text, they have bond-servant in the margin, and sometimes they have not. A notable instance of the latter is in the phrase, "My servants the prophets." I suppose they thought it rather incongruous to say my "bond-servants" the prophets (Rev. x. 7). The same remark is applicable to Rev. i. 1. When "B." asks, "Does it matter much whether the word be translated servant, bond-servant, or slave?" he shows an amount of information which is compatible with the rest of his letter.

R. DONALDSON.

December 6th, 1889.

IN the Manchester Consistory Court a faculty was recently granted by Chancellor Christie for the erection in St. Mathew's Church, Ardwick, of a Communion-table of oak upon a footpace in the north chapel, surmounted by an oak shelf or bracket fixed to the north-east wall of the church, and for placing thereon two candlesticks and vases for flowers.

THE seventh annual festival of the Working Men's Bible-class, connected with St. Stephen's, Westminster, was celebrated on the 30th ult. At six o'clock a full choral service was held in the church, and a sermon preached by Archdeacon Sinclair. The annual dinner followed, and a public meeting was subsequently held in the Burdett Hall. Addresses were delivered by Mr. Burdett-Coutts, M.P. (who presided), Archdeacon Sinclair, Major-General Sim, the Revs. R. Thompson, A. J. Carlyle, J. MacArthur, and others.

AN application was made before Lord Penzance on the 26th ult. in a proceeding against the Rev. George Collins, vicar of Charlesworth, under the Church Discipline Act. Mr. A. B. Kempe, for the promoter, Mr. Borough, said the complaint against Mr. Collins was that on the 2nd of October he was convicted before a court of summary jurisdiction of having been intoxicated on the public highway. He asked Lord Penzance to receive letters of request. This was done, and a citation was directed to be issued.

A COMMEMORATION of the Faithful Departed was held by the English Church Union on the 26th ult. at St. Alban's, Holborn. The celebrant was the Rev. G. R. Hogg, the Rev. R. A. J. Suckling acting as deacon, and the Rev. H. M. Willington as sub-deacon. The Creed ended, the Rev. T. Outram Marshall from the chancel steps read the names of those members of the Union who had departed this life in the past year, the roll consisting of thirty-nine priests, eighty-three laymen, and 105 women, and on concluding the list ejaculated:—"On whose souls, and on all Christian souls, God have mercy," to which the congregation responded with a fervent "Amen," and with the repetition of the Lord's Prayer. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Arthur Tooth on Is. lxi. 3.

A MOVEMENT is on foot at Oxford to raise a fund in memory of Dr. Hatch. He had spent the best years of his abruptly shortened life in work which was, for the most part, far from remunerative; and as some amends for this it is proposed that the proceeds of the fund (after providing for a tablet or some other simple monument) should be handed over to trustees for the benefit of his family. The movement is being strongly supported. The Bishops of Durham and Salisbury, the Deans of Westminster and Winchester, the Master of Balliol, and the Regius Professors of Divinity at Oxford and Cambridge, with many other representative names from the English and Scotch Universities, are on the committee. The whole Theological Faculty at Oxford joins in the subscription. The first list, which was issued at the end of last week, amounts to between £500 and £600.

THE dedication festival at St. Andrew's, Wells-street, was observed as usual on St. Andrew's Day. The first evensong took place at 5 p.m. on the eve; the anthem was from Mendelssohn's *Athalie*. At 8.15 a second evensong followed, when the church was well filled by the poor of the parish. The Rev. T. B. Dover, of St. Agnes, Kennington, was the preacher. On St. Andrew's Day there were celebrations at 6, 7 (choral), and 8. At 11 matins and fourth celebrations followed. The *Te Deum* by Galuppi was effectively sung. The music for the Communion office was Mozart's Second Mass in C. The Rev. J. Storrs, of St. Peter's, Eaton-square, preached a very thoughtful sermon on the example of St. Andrew as shown in the power of influence. Evensong was sung at 5, the anthem being part of the 13th Psalm by Liszt. At 7 p.m. the three confraternities and members of the other parish institutions were entertained at tea in St. Andrew's Hall, after which a concert was given by the choir, assisted by some ladies of the congregation. The choir school prizes were distributed, and a very pleasant evening was passed. On the Monday there was a service for the school children, who afterwards had their annual tea. Later in the evening a *conversazione* was held in the Portman-rooms, at which Colonel Arbutnot, C.B., presided. The Vicar, in an interesting speech, thanked the many lay-helpers who assist him in carrying on the work of the parish.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

- Aldrich-Blake, Rev. Frederick Hooper, M.A., Vicar of Bishopswood.
 Bell, Rev. Colin Edward Beever, Succentor of the Pro-Cathedral, Liverpool; Precentor of Chester Cathedral.
 Bell, Rev. G. L., Curate of Romsey; Diocesan Chaplain to the Bishop of Inverness.
 Browne, Rev. Arthur Heber, B.A., Chaplain at Sharpness Docks; Sub-Warden Church Training College for Lay-Workers, Commercial-road, Stepney.
 Crabtree, Rev. James, Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Marton, near Blackpool.
 Eales, Rev. E. F., Curate-in-Charge of St. Aidan's, Crew's Hole, Bristol.
 Gardner, Rev. J. L., Curate-in-Charge of Mission Church, Bartley-green, Birmingham.
 Gray, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Rector of Bepton, Midhurst, Sussex.
 Hall, Rev. Samuel Howard, M.A., Vicar of Menston-in-Wharfedale; Rector of Sproatley, Hull.
 Hicks, Rev. Elgar, Vicar of Billesdon, Leicestershire.
 Ingram, Rev. D. S., M.A., Head Master of Felstead School; Rector of Great Oakley, Essex.
 Latter, Rev. A. S., M.A., Rector of Downham, Norfolk; Rector of Outwell, Wisbech.
 Mason, Rev. A. L. A., M.A., Rector of Westley, Cambs; Incumbent of St. Catherine's Church, Stuttgart.
 Murray, Rev. John Davidson Munro, M.A., Vicar of Nynehead, Somerset.
 Robson, Rev. J., B.A., Junior Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Exeter; Vicar of Harton Colliery, South Shields.
 Rust, Rev. A., Chaplain at Dunkerque; Vicar of Lower Sundown-with-Streatley, Bedfordshire.
 Shawcross, Rev. William Henry, Vicar of Bretforton, Evesham.
 Snowden, Rev. Edmund, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Huddersfield; Honorary Canon in Wakefield Cathedral.
 Townson, Rev. Christopher, Vicar of St. Paul's, Farington, near Preston.
 Watson, Rev. Alfred William Brown, B.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
 Watts, Rev. Edwin, M.A., Rector of Scarborough-with-Leconfield, Yorkshire.
 Willson, Rev. Vere T., M.A., Organising Secretary for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the Diocese of Lincoln.
 Woodcock, Rev. Reginald Henry, B.A., Rector of Boddington, Northamptonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

- Baugh, Rev. Folliott, for nearly forty years Rector of Chelsfield, at St. George's-place, Hyde Park-corner, on the 7th inst., aged 80.
 Bayliss, Rev. W. Wyke, M.A., Rector of Upham, at Upham, on the 5th inst., aged 55.
 Garwood, Rev. John, M.A., for nearly forty years Clerical Secretary of the London City Mission, at 17, Cambridge-road, Kilburn, on the 6th inst., aged 85.
 Hope, Rev. William, M.A., forty-two years Vicar of St. Peter's, Derby, at Derby, on the 8th inst., aged 67.
 Johnson, Rev. William, A.M., late Rector of Clenore, and Chancellor of the Dioceses of Cloyne and Ross, at 5, Crosthwaite-park, Kingstown, on the 1st inst., aged 89.
 Johnson, Rev. Robert William, M.A., for upwards of fifty years Vicar of the parish, at Packwood, on the 9th inst., aged 76.
 Jones, the Ven. John, Incumbent of Christ Church, Waterloo, and late Archdeacon of Liverpool, at Waterloo, Liverpool, on the 5th inst., aged 98.
 Milne, Rev. Richard Henry, Vicar of Goathland, Yorkshire, at North Berwick, N.B., on the 6th inst., aged 45.
 Moir, Rev. John, late Dean of Glasgow and Incumbent of St. John's, Jedburgh, at Kilburn Bank, Newport-on-Tay, on the 5th inst., aged 75.
 Stafford, Rev. Berkeley Buckingham De B. H., at St. Helier's, Jersey, on the 5th inst., aged 67.
 Sturges, Rev. Simon, thirty years Vicar of the parish, at Wargrave, suddenly, on the 3rd inst., aged 72.



The Church of England Pulpit.

TRUTH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL ON
SUNDAY, DECEMBER 9TH, 1888.

"For even Christ pleased not Himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon Me. For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."—ROMANS xv. 3, 4.

WHEN the Apostle makes this general statement, "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning," he is, after his wont, answering an objection which he does not notice. The objection which he feels instinctively will arise in the minds of some of his readers is that portions of the Old Testament "things written aforetime," as he calls them, and particularly the passage he has just quoted, are not so well suited for Christian instruction as he has assumed to be the case. His purpose in making the quotation to which we have just listened was to bring about a more brotherly feeling than existed at the time between the two great divisions of the Roman Church—the converts from Judaism and the converts from heathenism. There was a great deal of friction between these classes, which became especially apparent in their different beliefs respecting the kinds of foods that might rightly be eaten, and the rites which ought to be observed as holy by individual Christians, and apart from any regulations of the Church of Christ on these subjects. The Jewish converts, who were probably in point of numbers a minority, fearing that some legal defect might probably attach to any meat that they might buy in the public markets of Rome took refuge in vegetarianism—"He that is weak eateth herbs." And they also clung to the observance of days and seasons which they had held sacred in their old Jewish life. With all this the converts from heathenism had no sympathy, and they were disposed to treat with a rough intolerance the scruples of men whom they thought of and spoke of as "weak." The Apostle, Jew though he was by birth, held that the converts from heathenism were substantially right in their view of the case; but he did not approve of their scornful and impatient way of urging it. They took delight in words and acts which caused much distress to the Jewish converts. They were for

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 730.

stamping out observances which their taste and their reason condemned. The Apostle held that these private observances were of no importance excepting as representing a pure intention of serving God, and that the strength of mind on which the Gentile converts prided themselves ought to have enabled them to enter considerably into the point of view of their Jewish opponents. When he tells us, "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his neighbour for his good to edification," and then he adds as a reason that even Christ pleased not Himself. He might have illustrated this, we think, by referring to many acts in our Lord's life, and especially to His voluntary death and passion on the Cross, but he does refer to a passage in Psalm lxi., as it is written: "The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on Me."

Now this psalm is ascribed to David by the inscription, and also by St. Paul himself in another quotation which he makes, from which he showed David's circumstances from his flight from Jerusalem at the time of Absalom's rebellion, more accurately known than any circumstances in the lifetime of Jeremiah or of any of those writers after the exile to whom some critics nowadays assign it. But although the psalm was David's, and David in it is describing his own troubles, a Jewish Christian would not have been surprised at St. Paul applying the words to our Lord Jesus Christ, for he would have known that the Jewish books, or some of them, already understood these words of the promised Messiah, and as he believed Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah, he had no difficulty in following the Apostle when the Apostle used David's account of his own troubles as an account of the sorrows of Jesus. He would have felt with the Apostle that if it was true that the rebukes of the enemies of the reign of God in Israel fell on David, who, in his day, represented it, much more true in a later age was this of our Lord Jesus Christ, who "pleased not Himself, but endured sorrow and reproach for the sake of the Father and to do His will." The Jewish Christian, then, would have felt no difficulty about the quotation, but with a convert from heathenism the case would have been very different, whether he was an Italian, or a Greek settled in Rome; but especially if he was a Greek, he would have had many difficulties to get over in accepting the Old Testament at all, it would have been foreign to his whole mode of thought. He could have understood the attraction of the teaching and of the redeeming love of our Lord and Saviour, but he would only have accepted the Old Testament on our Lord's authority, and would have doubted, at any rate at first, whether he, with his mental antecedents, had very much to learn from it, and therefore St. Paul's use of it on this occasion would have seemed to him to be arbitrary

and unintelligible. "Why," he would have asked, "why should a psalm written by David, and referring to David's personal circumstances more than a thousand years before, be thus used to portray the life and character of the Lord Jesus?" This, then, was the difficulty which St. Paul had in his eyes, and he meets it by laying down a broad principle which includes a great deal else besides. "Whatsoever things," he says, and therefore, among the rest this 69th Psalm, "were written aforetime" in the Jewish Scriptures, were written for learning or instruction of us Christians, that we, through the patience which those Scriptures enjoin, and through the comfort which it administers, might have hope in this life and beyond it.

Now let us consider some few of the truths which this statement of the Apostle's appears to imply. It implies first of all at the very least the trustworthiness of the Old Testament. I say its trustworthiness; I do not for the moment go so far as to say its inspiration. Unless a book or a man be trustworthy, it is impossible to feel confidence in it or in him, and confidence in an instructor is the very first condition of receiving instruction to any good purpose. Now, if this be so, it shows that the Apostle would have had nothing to do with any estimate of the books of the Old Testament, which is fatal to belief in their trustworthiness. We may have noticed, perhaps, that when estimates of this kind are put forward, as is occasionally the case, they are commonly prefaced by the observation that the Christian Church has never defined what inspiration is, and it is left to be inferred that a book may still be, in some singular sense, inspired, although the statements which it contains are held by the critic to be opposed to the truth of history or to the truth of morals. It is no doubt true that no authoritative definition of what the inspiration of Holy Scripture is, and what it does and does not permit or imply, has ever been propounded by the Church of Christ, just as she has propounded no definition of the manner and effect of the action of the Holy Spirit on the souls of men. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, and canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth." Our Lord's words apply to an inspired book not less than to a sanctified soul, but at the same time, both in the case of the soul and of the book, we can see that there are certain things which are inconsistent with the action of the Holy Spirit; just as wilful sin is incompatible with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the soul, so in veracity is incompatible with the claim of a book to have been inspired by the Author of all truth. Thus to take one example in the Book of Deuteronomy, long addresses are ascribed to Moses, and Moses describes a series of events of which he claims to have been an eye-witness. If, then, we are told that these addresses and these narratives

were in reality unknown to the real Moses, that they were composed by some Jew or Israelite endowed with a high idealising faculty, who lived many centuries after Moses, and thus, although the book was undoubtedly imposed upon the conscience of the Jewish people, at any rate after the exile, as being the work of Moses himself, we must observe that such a representation is irreconcilable, I do not say, with the inspiration, but with the veracity of the book, which certainly claims to be one thing and is, according to the critic, quite another; or if a striking prediction in the 8th chapter of Daniel about King Antiochus Epiphanes, was really, as some modern critics would have it, written after the event referred to, and thrown into the form of prediction by some scribe of the second century before Christ, in order to encourage the Jews in their long struggle with the great Græco-Syrian power, then it must be said that the book in which it occurs is not a trustworthy book. The writer is endeavouring to produce national enthusiasm by means of representations which he must have known to be contrary to fact. No doubt language and history are sciences which will have their say about the books of the Old Testament, and I am far from implying that their greatest masters are committed to the things just referred to. What we, you and I, have to take note of is this, that unless there be such a thing as inspiration of in veracity we must choose between the authority of some of our modern critical advisers and any belief whatever in the inspiration of the books which they handle after this fashion—nay, more, any belief in the permanent value of these books as source of Christian or of human instruction. Nobody now expects to be instructed by the false Decretals, because all the world knows that they were composed in the ninth century, with a view of building up the fabric of the Papal authority, by making the first bishops of Rome write as they might have written had they lived seven or eight hundred years later than they did. Certainly every trustworthy book is not inspired. Our booksellers' shops are full of honest books which make no pretence to inspiration; but a book claiming inspiration, ought at least to be trustworthy, and a literature which is said to be inspired for the instruction of the world must not be held by its exponents and defenders to fall below the level which is required for the ordinary purposes of human intercourse. For Christians it will be enough to know that our Lord Jesus Christ has the set the seal of His infallible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament. He found the Hebrew canon just as we have it in our hands to-day, and He treated it as an authority which was above discussion. Nay, more, He went out of His way, if we may reverentially speak thus, to sanction not a few portions of it which our modern scepticism too eagerly rejects. When He

would warn His hearers against the dangers of spiritual relapse, He bade them remember Lot's wife; when He would point how worldly engagements might blind the soul to the coming judgment, He reminds them how men ate and drank, and married and were giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the Ark and the flood came and destroyed them all; when He would put His finger on that fact in past Jewish history which, by its admitted reality, would warrant belief in His own coming resurrection, He points to Jonah three days and three nights in the whale's belly; when standing on the Mount of Olives with the Holy City at His feet, He would quote that prophecy, the fulfilment of which would mark for His followers that this impending doom had at last arrived, He desires them to flee to the mountains, when they shall see "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet standing in the Holy Place." Are we to suppose that in these and other references to the Old Testament our Lord was only using what are called *ad hominem* arguments, or talking down to the level of a popular ignorance which He Himself did not share, not to point out the inconsistency of this supposition with His character as a perfectly sincere religious teacher? It may be observed that in the Sermon on the Mount he carefully marks off those features of the popular Jewish religion which He rejects, in a manner which makes it certain that had He not Himself believed in the historic truth of the events and the persons to which He thus refers, He must have said so. But did He then share a popular belief which our higher knowledge has shown to be popular ignorance, and was He mistaken as to the worth of these Scriptures to which He so often and so confidently appealed? There are those who bear the Christian name who do not shrink from saying as much as this, but they will find it difficult to persuade mankind that if He could be mistaken on a matter of such strictly religious importance as this He can be safely trusted about anything else. Yes, the trustworthiness of the Old Testament is, in fact, inseparable from the trustworthiness of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if we believe that He is the true light of the world, we shall resolutely close our eyes against any suggestions of the falsehood of those Hebrew Scriptures which have received the stamp of His Divine authority.

But the Apostle's statement implies next that the Jewish Scriptures have a world-wide and enduring value. They were written, he said, for our instruction—that is, for the instruction of the Apostolic Church, which confidently aspired to embrace the world, they were written for human beings generally, in all places at all times. Could such a statement be made about any other national literature, ancient or modern? Some instruction, no doubt, is to be gathered from the literature of

every people. The critics of the human mind, in all its phases and in circumstances the most unpromising, have generally something to tell us. But, on the other hand, there is a great deal in the very finest uninspired literature that cannot be described as permanently or universally instructing—much in the ancient Greek, much in that of our own country, and, therefore, when the Apostle says of a great collection of books of various characters, various dates, and on various subjects, embodying the legislation, the history, the poetry, the morals of a simple Eastern people, that whatsoever was contained in them had been set down for the instruction of men of another and a wider faith, they living in a later age, and by Divine amplification for the instruction of all human beings, certainly we think it an astonishing assertion. Clearly, if the Apostle is to be believed, these books cannot be like any other similar collections of national laws, records, poems, and proverbs. There must be in them some quality or qualities which warrant this lofty estimate.

And here we may observe that as books rise in the scale of excellence, whatever their authorship or their outward form, they tend towards exhibiting a permanence and universality of interest. They rise above the local and personal incidents of their production; they show qualities which address themselves to the minds and hearts of the human race. This is, as we all know, the case within limits of our own Shakspeare. The ascendancy of his genius is clearly independent of the circumstances of his life, of which, indeed, we know scarcely anything, and of the dramatic form into which he threw his mighty thoughts. He has been read and re-read, commented on and discussed, by nine generations of Englishmen, his phrases have passed into the language so that we constantly quote him without knowing it. His authority as an analyst and exponent of human nature has steadily grown with the advancing years. Nay, despite the eminently English form of his writings, German critics have claimed him as being, in virtue of the form of his thought, a virtual fellow-countryman of theirs, and even the peoples of the Latin race, who would have more difficulty in understanding him, have not been slow to offer him the homage of their sincere sympathy and admiration. And yet by what an interval is Shakspeare parted from the books of the Hebrew Scriptures? His great dramatic creations we feel after all are only the workmanship of a very shrewd human observer, with the limitation of a human point of view, and with the restrictive moral authority which is all that the highest human genius can claim. But here is a Book which provides for human nature as a whole, which makes this profession with an insight and fancifulness that does not belong, I dare to say it, to the mind or heart of the most gifted man. Could any moral human author ever have stood

the test which the Old Testament has stood. For what has it been to the Jewish people through the tragic vicissitudes of their wonderful history; for what has it been to Christendom for nineteen centuries? It has formed the larger part of the religious note-book of the Christian Church, it has shaped Christian hopes, it has largely governed Christian legislation, it has supplied the language for Christian prayer and praise; the noblest, the saintliest souls in Christendom have one after another fed their souls on it, or even on little fragments of it; taken a verse and shut the spiritual ear to everything else, and in virtue of the concentrated intensity with which they have thus sought for days, and weeks, and months, and years to penetrate the inmost secrets of that one fragment of its concentrated language, have risen even to heroic ideas of effort and endurance. Throughout the Christian centuries the Old Testament has been a mine constantly worked, and far to-day from being exhausted. Well might the old poet cry, "I am as glad of Thy Word as one that findeth great spoil." "The law of the Lord is an undefiled law, converting souls; the testimony of the Lord is sure, and it is wisdom to the simple." "The statutes of the Lord are right and rejoice the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure and giveth light unto the eyes, more to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold, sweeter, also, than honey of the honeycomb." Even those portions of the Old Testament which seem at first sight least promising, have some instruction to give us if we will only look out for it.

Its genealogies, apparently so long and so dry, which occur constantly in the historical books, may remind us when we examine the names attentively sometimes of the awful responsibility which attaches to the transmission of the gift of life, of a type of character which we had ourselves perchance modified, to another, and, perhaps, a distant generation; or sometimes they suggest the care with which all that bears upon the human ancestry of our Lord and Saviour was treasured up, unconsciously in not a few cases, in the records of the people of revelation. Those accounts, too, of fierce war and indiscriminate slaughter, such as attended the extermination of the Canaanites, suggest the implacable thoroughness with which we should endeavour to extirpate the sins which may long have settled in our hearts. Those minute ritual directions of the law which might at first read like the rubrics of a system which had for ever passed away, should, as they might, bring before us first one and then another aspect of that to which assuredly they point—the redeeming worth of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But this last illustration suggests another fact which is implied in the Apostle's statement, it suggests the truth that a second or deeper sense of Scripture constantly underlies the primary literal, superficial sense. That a narrative should

have two senses, one which it suggests to the reader at first sight, and another, its deeper, but which is only discovered on reflection, may at first sight strike us as strange. But Scripture itself tells us that this is the case. Nobody, of course, would ever expect to find the second sense in an uninspired book, however well written. In Lord Macaulay's "History of England," for instance, we read what he has to say about the events which he describes, and there is an end to it. But this is not true of the Old Testament Scriptures. If we, as Christians, go to the New Testament in order to discover how we should read the Old, we find ourselves constantly guided to search for a second spiritual sense which underlies the letter. Thus the account in the Book of Genesis of Abraham's relations with Hagar, with Sara, with Ishmael, and with Isaac, might at first seem to have no further object than that of displaying a historical series of relations which existed in later ages between Israel and certain of the desert tribes. But if we turn to St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle bids us penetrate much deeper and see in these two ancient mothers the Jewish and the Christian Covenants, of the Jewish and the Christian Churches, and in their children here the spiritual slaves of the Mosaic law, and there the enfranchised sons of the mother of us all, the Christian Jerusalem. And in like manner St. Paul teaches the Corinthians in his First Epistle to see in the Exodus from Egypt and in the events which followed it, not a bare series of historical occurrences, but the fellowship of Christian privileges and of Christian failings. These things, he said, happened to them for types or patterns of something beyond, and thus they were written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world have come.

These are but two out of the many illustrations that might be given. And so in the early church there arose a great school of interpreters which concerned itself almost exclusively with the discovery and the exhibition of the second sense of Scripture. That some of these interpreters might have made mistakes whether in forcefulness or exaggeration is probable enough, but the principle on which they went to work was taught them by the Apostles. They felt the depth of the resources of the Divine Word; they had in its wealth of meaning a sort of sensible proof of its inspiration. They dwelt upon the fact that the Divine mind sees each event, not as we do singly, but in relation to other events which, at whatever distance of time, have some sort of correspondence with it; sees the spiritual in the material; sees the eternal in the temporal; sees the man and his future in that which to man is present sense. To the Divine intelligence all is present, and there is neither past nor future. On some such considerations as these does the doctrine of the second sense of Scripture rest; but in

any case it is warranted by the Divine teaching of the New Testament, and it alone enables us to understand how some difficult parts of the Old Testament can be written for our learning at all. Take, for instance, the Song of Solomon. Taken in its literal sense the Song of Solomon describes scenes in the court of Solomon which must doubtless be paralleled in those of other Eastern princes, but which hardly correspond to the Apostle's description of being written for our instruction, "that through patience and comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope." But if in the Jewish Talmud itself, and an overwhelming majority of Christian interpreters, we not only recognise the second sense lying beneath the letter of this book, but also understand that this second sense is much more important for us to know than the literal or primary sense; if the headings of our authorised version suggest that we see in the "beloved" our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the "bride" either the Church or the Christian soul, then the book becomes a repertory of the very highest spiritual truth which, so far as we can see, could hardly have been adequately expressed in any other form. The necessity of recognising some such sense in the book has been almost universally admitted by Christian interpreters, and those modern schools or groups of scholars who have rejected it have generally ended by abandoning more or less decisively the teaching of the book altogether.

Indeed, the neglect of this secondary and spiritual sense of Scripture has sometimes led Christians to mis-apply the Old Testament very seriously. Thus, for instance, both the soldiers of Raymond of Toulouse who made war on the Albigenses in the thirteenth century, and the Puritans who made war on the Church in the sixteenth century, appealed to the early wars of the Israelites as a sanction for indiscriminate slaughter. They forgot that the promulgation of the law of charity by our Lord had made such an appeal impossible for Christians, they forgot that most instructive saying outside the Samaritan village which had refused Him a welcome, and on which two of His followers would have had Him call down fire from heaven, His most significant rebuke, "Ye know not what spirit ye are of." Dwelling on the letter of the narrative of the Book of Joshua, they missed its true and lasting but deeper import, the eternal witness that it bears to God's hatred of moral evil, and the duty of making war incessant, implacable, indiscriminate war upon those passions which too easily erect their Jericho or their Ai within the Christian soul itself, and are only conquered by resolute perseverance and courage. And this second sense of Scripture is especially instructive as a guide to the knowledge and love of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the end as of the law, so of the whole of the Old Testament, to every one that believeth. No doubt the literal sense of the Old Testament often points to Psalms like the

22nd or the 110th. Prophecies such as Isaiah's of the virginal birth, and of the Man of Sorrows, can properly be referred to no one else. But there is much which has a primary reference to some saint, or hero, or event of the day, which yet in its deeper significance points on to Him. This depends not upon any arbitrary or fanciful feeling, but on the principle that He is the recapitulation, as an early Christian writer expresses it, of all that is exalted in humanity; and that all which is true, heroic, saintly, pathetic, and which we see elsewhere only in fragments, meet in Him as the personal representative of the rest. Only when this is understood do we read the Old Testament with Christian eyes, read it as the first Christians were wont to read it. Only then do we understand the full meaning and purpose of much which else is veiled from our sight. All this great deliverance from Egypt and Babylonia, foreshadowed a greater deliverance beyond; all these elaborate rights of purification and sacrifice, which have no meaning apart from the one sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, and that succession of saints and heroes who, with all their imperfections, point onwards and upwards to One who dignifies their feebleness and broken lives by making them in not a few respects anticipations of His glorious self.

Do we understand the truth of that profound saying of the great Augustine, that as the Old Testament is patent in the New, so the New Testament is latent in the Old. The second Sunday in Advent might almost be called the yearly Festival of Holy Scripture. The collect for the day is found within the covers of more than half our Bibles, and it is based upon the words which we have been considering—the words of the Apostle. But still, St. Paul in these words is treating only of the Old Testament. The collect expands his meaning when it reminds us that all Holy Scriptures are written for our learning, the New Testament not less than the Old. Well would it be for you and for me if we could take that truth seriously to heart, and lay out our time so as to act upon it. The Bible is indeed the most interesting book in the world to the poet, to the historian, to the philosopher; to the student of human nature, to the lover of the picturesque and of the marvellous, to the man of letters, to the man of affairs. To each of these it has much to say that he will find nowhere else. But no one of these, if he confine himself to his special interest, will secure the gift, the gift of gifts, which the Bible was really intended to convey.

When you entered this great temple of Jesus Christ this afternoon, there were many separate subjects which might have suggested themselves to you—the faultless proportions of the building, the materials of which it is composed, the skill and genius of the architect, the monuments of the dead that everywhere meet the eye, the events of the history of our Church and country which have

been witnessed within its walls or on its site; and then, again, the accessories of divine service, the various pieces of distinctly religious furniture in the church, the beauty of the music, the order and the sequence of Psalm and lesson, of creed and anthem. Yet these are all, the highest and the lowest, but details, if regarded with reference to that supreme purpose which this Cathedral itself, and all those in it, and all that takes place in it, should certainly suggest. That purpose is nothing less than leading each soul, aye, a great company of souls, in unison to ascend to true union with Him who is the infinite and the eternal; to leave behind them, to escape from, to break, to trample on, as the need of each may be, those earthly allurements and fetters which would seduce or hold them back from the true end of their existence; to forget for awhile the outer world, and leave its pleasures, its annoyances, its intrigues, its passions, its disappointments, its sorrows, its ambitions, its jealousies, its splendours, its degradation; and to rise—to rise, in the prophet's phrase—on wings of eagles towards the sun of the moral world, the Father, the Redeemer, the Sanctifier of the human soul.

But when we take up the Bible we enter in spirit a far more splendid temple, which has needed some fifteen centuries to build, and of which the variety of the resources distance comparison with this Cathedral. It is a temple built, not in stone and marble, but with human words, and yet enshrining within it for the comfort and the correction and encouragement of every human soul no other and no else than the Holy and Eternal Word. Of that temple, the Old Testament is the nave, its side aisles the song of prophecy, the gospels are the choir, or chancel—the last Gospel perhaps the very sanctuary itself, whilst around are the Apostolic Epistles and the Apocalypse, each of them gems of beauty, each supplying some indispensable feature to the splendid whole. With what joy should we dwell under that temple? with what profound reverence should we cross its threshold? with what care should we make a note that nothing is meaningless?—each feature, each ornament that decorates wall or pillar, or window, or roof. How high should we set our expectation of the blessings that may be secured within it? How open and yet how submissive should be our hearts to the voices that are not of this world, that might touch and change and purify us, as we drift on in the swift, relentless current of time towards the end of life, as days, and weeks, and months, and years follow each other in breathless haste, and we reflect now and then for a moment that, at any rate for us, much of this earthly career has passed irrevocably. What are the anxieties of the thoughts—aye, what the books that command our attentions? What have we read and left unread? What time do we give to the Bible?

No other book, let us be sure of it, can equally avail to prepare us for that which lies before us, for the unknown anxieties and sorrows which are sooner or later the portion of most men and women, for the gradual approach of death, for the passage into the unseen world, for the sights and scenes that will then burst upon us in the period, be it long or short, of waiting and preparation for the throne and face of the Eternal Judge. Looking back over that world, how shall we desire to have made the most of our best guide to it, how shall we grudge the hours we have wasted on that which only belongs to time. O Lord, Thy Word endureth for ever in Heaven, Thy truth also remaineth from one generation to another. If my delight had not been in Thy law, I should have perished in my trouble. I will never forget Thy commandments, for with them Thou hast spoken to me.

CHRISTIANITY THE ANTIDOTE TO SLAVERY.

BY THE REV. A. PLUMMER, D.D., MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

SERMON PREACHED IN DURHAM CATHEDRAL ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITIES MISSION TO CENTRAL AFRICA ON ADVENT SUNDAY, DECEMBER, 1889.

"All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations."—S. MATT. xxviii. (part of 18 and 19).

IT is just one hundred years since William Wilberforce made his first speech in the House of Commons in favour of the abolition of the slave-trade. The influence of those who were interested in this infamous traffic in human flesh was such that the subject was shelved time after time; and when, after years of hard work by the members of the Anti-Slavery Society, the subject at last came to a division in the House, although the motion for the abolition was supported by Pitt, Fox, and Burke, it was rejected by 163 votes to 88: so utterly asleep was the national conscience on the subject. It was not until 1807 that the Bill for abolishing the slave-trade in the dominions of Great Britain became law—more than thirty years after the first proposal on the subject had been made in the English Parliament. For Wilberforce, although the first to devote himself with thoroughness to this noble work in the House of Commons, was not the first to move in the matter either inside or outside of Parliament. No one laments that his name has been, and remains, so inseparably connected with this change in our laws,—perhaps the most glorious which the English legislature has ever made, and which, but for his self-devotion, might, to the continued disgrace of England, have been delayed for many years longer. But one does lament that nearly all the names of the others, who shared—and perhaps with as much

devotion as Wilberforce—in the toil and in the repeated disappointments, have passed out of remembrance. There are probably many in this congregation who could not mention one of them—many to whom Thomas Clarkson is a mere name, and who never even heard of Granville Sharp, not to mention any more. Yet it was Granville Sharp who got that magnificent principle established, of which we are all so proud, that, as soon as a slave sets foot on English territory, he is free. This was decided in the case of the negro James Somerset by Lord Mansfield and a strong bench of judges, June 22nd, 1772. The “Memoirs of Granville Sharp, composed from his own MSS.” by Prince Hoare, 1820, are probably not much read now; but they are full of interest. I venture to bring before you an extract from them, which has an obvious bearing upon the cause which I have to plead this afternoon—the cause of the Universities Mission to Central Africa. It is an anecdote respecting a negro prince of noble character who, towards the end of the last century, was sovereign chief of Sierra Leone, close to which is our own college of Fourah Bay. His name was Naimbanna. When there was mentioned in his presence the name of a person who was understood by him to have publicly asserted something very degrading to the general character of Africans, he broke out into violent and vindictive language. He was immediately reminded of the Christian duty of forgiving his enemies, upon which he answered nearly in the following words: “If a man should rob me of my money, I can forgive him; if a man should shoot at me, or try to stab me, I can forgive him; if a man should sell me and all my family to a slave-ship, so that we should pass all the rest of our days in slavery in the West Indies; I can forgive him; but (added he, rising from his seat with much emotion) if a man takes away the character of the people of my country, I never can forgive him.” Being asked why he could not extend his forgiveness to those who took away the character of the people of his country, he answered: “If a man should try to kill me, or should sell me and my family for slaves, he would do an injury to as many as he might kill or sell; but if any one takes away the character of black people, that man injures black people all over the world; and when he has once taken away their character, there is nothing which he may not do to black people ever after. That man, for instance, will beat black men, and say, Oh, it is only a black man; why should not I beat him? That man will make slaves of black people; for when he has taken away their character, he will say, Oh, they are only black people; why should not I make them slaves? That man will take away all the people of Africa if he can catch them; and if you ask him, But why do you take away all these people? he will say, Oh, they are only black people—they are not like white people—why should not I take them? That is

the reason why I cannot forgive the man who takes away the character of the people of my country.” (Pp. 368, 369).

This African prince had only too good reason for his estimate of the consequences of attributing a vile and degraded character to the whole negro race. It was then, and to a very grievous extent it is now, one of the chief causes of the untold miseries which that suffering race has had to endure, and is still enduring. The Mahometan creed, which has consecrated slavery by teaching Mahometans that all unbelievers may rightly be enslaved by the faithful, has done a great deal towards fostering the evil. The insatiable greed of traders, whether Mahometan or Christian, has done still more. But the inhuman contempt for all negroes as such has done most of all. The most excruciating sufferings in their case are treated as nothing. The death of any number of them, no matter by what means, is treated as nothing. “They are only negroes” is the thought, and sometimes the outspoken explanation; as if that must at once put every one’s mind at rest.

Slowly, but surely, the nations of Europe have been giving up this diabolical point of view, which is a degradation to every one who holds it; and it is a happy coincidence that just a hundred years after Wilberforce began the attempt to drive it out of the House of Commons almost all the Powers of Europe are gathered together in serious conference at Brussels to concert measures for stamping it out in Africa, or at least to prevent the Arab traders from acting upon it. Let us all pray for a blessing upon their deliberations, which, if successful, may do more for the good of Africa in the next thirty years than has been done during the last three centuries. No such conference has ever before been held; it is absolutely without a parallel in history. Excepting Greece and the Balkan States, all the European Powers, with Persia, America, and the Congo State, have sent representatives; to decide no question of territory, or of tribute, or of trade, or of war, but to promote a purely humanitarian object; to endeavour to remove the difficulties which at present prevent civilized nations from combining to put down that monster abomination, which John Wesley described as “the sum of all human villainies.” It is a matter for thankfulness that one of our own representatives is Sir John Kirk, who for many years was Consul-General at Zanzibar, and moreover was the friend of Livingstone, who taught him, as few other men could have taught him, the unspeakable infamy of the slave-trade, and the rank growth of attendant evils which shoot up wherever that trade is allowed to establish itself.

Nor is this the only happy event which marks the hundredth anniversary of Wilberforce’s first Parliamentary speech against the slave-trade. This year, thanks to the direct influence of our energetic Consul, Mr. Portal, and to the indirect influence of

the Universities Mission, the Sultan of Zanzibar has published two decrees, one of which ordains that after November 1st, 1889, all slaves entering his dominions are to be declared free; the other that the children of slaves born in the Sultan's dominions after January 1st, 1890, are to be free. We may be sure that the influences which have succeeded in obtaining these decrees will not allow them to remain a dead letter; and to these influences must be added the moral effect, even if there is nothing more for the moment, of the Brussels Conference. Abolition by gradual extinction is the sentence pronounced on slavery in his dominions by the Sultan of Zanzibar.

It is in the operation of these two decrees that the beneficial effects of the Universities Mission will, in a very special way, make themselves felt. The emancipated slave, when left to himself, is not a pleasing member of society. Slavery teaches many vices and few virtues, and self-control is not one of the virtues which it instils. Too often the freed slave does not know what to do with his newly acquired freedom. It is Christianity, and Christianity alone, that can teach him that. The Gospel teaches him that he has exchanged a yoke that is galling and degrading for one that is easy and glorious, and that in becoming his owner's freedman he has become the bond-servant of Jesus Christ. The self-devotion of the missionaries is to these poor creatures a strong proof of the reality of the religion which they preach. They work as no slave could be made to work, neither for money, nor for personal comfort, nor for aggrandisement, but to win the souls which have been bought by the blood of their unseen Master, and which have been so long kept back from Him by the fraud of the devil. And at the peril of their lives they stand by their flocks, even when statesmen advise them to flee. And we cannot doubt that the Apostolic journey of the Bishop this summer, from the coast to Lake Nyassa, will make an impression, very cheering to the Christians and encouraging to the backward. It was a walk of five weeks, almost always very labourious, and at times very perilous, owing to armed foes, wild beasts, sickness, and scarcity of provisions. For sixteen days the Bishop's party never fell in with a human being. The very few villages that they passed were all deserted, apparently through fear of the enemy. The last news of him was, that on the return journey he had been deserted by all his porters, owing to the war stirred up by the Portuguese. It is believed that he has made his way back to Nyassa.

But amid so much for which we ought to be deeply thankful there are some facts on the other side, not to the discredit of the missionaries, but perhaps to the discredit of ourselves who are so half-hearted in our efforts to support them. At the present moment there is a grievous want both of money and men. In August last the accounts

showed a deficit of nearly £1,500 as compared with the accounts at the same date last year. And death has been very busy among the missionaries during the last few months. Grave and constant anxiety, combined with over-work, has produced its natural result; and no less than four of the leading workers have gone to their rest and their reward. Think what that means in so small a staff, and what must be the thoughts of those who still remain at their posts, when they see their brethren literally worked to death, because we who sit comfortably at home in England will not send them the necessary supplies.

Has it ever occurred to any of ourselves to consider seriously whether we are not called upon to go out to the mission-field and help? God forbid that I should blame any one for answering that question in the negative. But perhaps there is something wrong if that question has never been raised. And when we have raised it, and have conscientiously decided that such work is not for us, can we conscientiously say that the help which we render to those who do go is at all what it ought to be? When we have found some valuable remedy for pain or disease, we are ready enough to make it known to others. When we have read some instructive or entertaining book, we are eager to assure others that they must on no account omit to read it. But the remedy which heals souls—the Book which makes wise unto salvation—we take little pains to make known to those who as yet know them not, and perhaps have no opportunity of knowing. What can this mean but that we ourselves do not value as we ought the priceless blessings which we enjoy? As an American writer has just expressed it: "It may be asked, which are the more guilty, those who need the Gospel and have it not, or those who have the Gospel and do not value it sufficiently to give it to those who cannot be saved without it?"* It may be more tolerable for Central Africa in the day of judgment than for us.

There is only too good reason for believing that the number of well-to-do Christians who make no attempt to give back anything like a tithe of their income to the God who lends it to them must be immense. How is it with ourselves? How do the time and money which we spend upon amusements and luxuries compare with the time and money which we spend upon promoting the good of our fellow-men, and especially upon promoting the extension of Christ's kingdom. "Make disciples of all the nations." That charge is given to all of us. If we cannot go ourselves, let us at least give generous help to those who do go. You have come here, perhaps, prepared to give some particular coin. If you double it, will it be more than you ought to give? To-day we begin the Church's year

* "Whither? A Theological Question for the Times," by C. A. Briggs, D.D. T. and T. Clark, pp. 4, 5. An able and earnest book.

anew. Let some generous offering, some earnest heartfelt prayer, bring a blessing on this Mission and on ourselves, and be an earnest of a Happy New Year.

ERRATUM.—In the Rev. Dr. Panter's sermon (page 278, paragraph 3) in our last week's issue for "super-added a story of wrong," read "sometimes superadded a story of wrong."

ANOTHER living, that of St. Nicholas', Shaldon, in the county of Devon, has lapsed to the University of Oxford, under the provisions of Act 3 James I., c. 5, and Convocation will elect to it on February 13th of next year. The number of presentations under this statute which have lately lapsed to this University, owing to the patrons being Roman Catholics, seems to have been somewhat unusually large.

THE Rev. Aubrey Lackington Moore, M.A., of Keble College, Oxford, has been elected to an official Fellowship at Magdalen, as Dean of Divinity. Mr. Moore, who is an Honorary Canon of Christ Church and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, was for some time after taking his degree Fellow and Tutor of St. John's (1873-6). He then left Oxford and took the living of Frenchay, near Bristol, from which in 1881 he returned to Oxford as tutor at Keble and Magdalen.

LAST Tuesday saw the close of the long and mysterious illness from which the Rev. G. F. Howard, formerly chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, had suffered. A man of a singularly active disposition, and of strong common sense, he filled several important university offices in turn, and discharged their duties admirably—whether in the judicious exercise of Proctorial discipline, the inspection and control of licensed lodging-houses, or the superintendence of the non-collegiate students. To one of his vigorous habits it must have been a severe privation to be suddenly condemned to a retired and sedentary life, but he nerved himself to bear long years of hopeless and protracted suffering with cheerfulness and courage. He always preserved the keenest interest in sides of University and college life in which he could no longer take a personal part, while he continued to the last to carry on his work as Censor of the non-collegiate students. The funeral was on Saturday at Grantchester, where he owned some property. There was a very large gathering, for none who had known him at all could fail to respect his kindness and his courage. He had never allowed his own suffering to obtrude itself, or to affect the warmth of the welcome he extended to his friends.

In the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA.
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
 and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly **CURED** by simply using the **AMMONIAPHONE**.

FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
 21s. post free. WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
 Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials **FREE OF CHARGE** may be had on application to **Medicine Battery Co. Ltd.** 52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1889.

INSANITARY HOUSES IN LONDON.

EVERY now and then the newspapers devote their attention to the alleged insanitary houses, of which some no doubt are to be found in the metropolitan area. We are, and always have been, of opinion that far more health and strength would accrue to our nation by the prevention of hereditary disease, especially that particular one, against which the Contagious Diseases Acts were so wisely enacted our by lawgivers in 1864, and so foolishly and sentimentally repealed in 1884, than by the most sumptuous feeding, clothing or housing of the poor. The body, especially its blood, is a far greater factor of health and strength than any food, raiment, or shelter. As a test of this position, some few years since we instanced the superior health, strength and longevity of the Hebrew and Turkish nations, whose religious rite is a very powerful protection against this and several other diseases, whilst their housing, clothing, and feeding is certainly not better than that of the average Christian denizen of our large cities. At the same time we are strongly of opinion that our artisans and labourers should not live in slums and "rookeries." Some of our medical officers contend that it is the enormous unchecked and unlicensed street-trading in London that so demoralises the traffickers as to convert them into the "rooks" that make the "rookeries." Doubtless to some degree "rooks" and "rookeries" act and re-act upon one another. However we are glad to see that within the last week or two applications have been made to the magistrates for orders to close houses which were stated to be unfit for human habitation. Some of these

applications were made by private individuals, who elected to apply directly to the magistrate rather than to the local authorities. Thus a number of ladies and gentlemen connected with the *Daily Telegraph* asked Mr. Bros, at the Clerkenwell Police Court, to close No. 3 Greville Street, Holborn. The Mansion House Council appealed to Mr. Lushington, at the Thames Police Court, to close five houses in Frimley Street, Mile End, and this latter request was granted.

Mr. Bros pointed out that the disadvantage of proceedings like those taken by private individuals was that the evidence was given in such a form that the Bench did not know what kind of order to make. The Nuisance Removal Act clearly intended that the local authorities should undertake these duties, and if not, the fact that private individuals could proceed, is, we think, a provision for cases in which the local authorities refuse or neglect to take action. Mr. Bros obviously adopted the best course in requesting the Medical Officer of Health to inspect the house so as to report the work which was required to be done.

In this case it was an unusually large kitchen in the basement that was complained of, but the Medical Officer could find no sanitary defects except a small damp spot on the wall, caused by the defective kitchen sink in the adjoining house, and a close smell from not opening the large window and door leading into the front area, which were both pasted up. He had the drain-pipe uncovered to the extent of fifteen feet, and found it to be sound—both air-tight and watertight in its joints. Inasmuch as the wall-paper at one corner of the room had been stained by the condensation of vapour on an iron water-supply pipe, the prophet of the *Daily Telegraph* had pronounced this kitchen to be a "vile cellar" so damp as to be entirely unfit for human habitation; whereas the Medical Officer of Health, after passing his hand over these apparently damp spots in the paper pronounced it to be "as dry as a bone." It is to be regretted that a good movement should be injured by a spirit of exaggeration, adopted not only by the newspaper alluded to, but by the correspondents of the *Guardian*. One of the latter writes, "that death and disease are among the products of rural landlordism and rural sanitary authorities," and that "it is absurd to leave the lives and health of the people in the hands of the landlords and farmers"! In London and its suburbs, we are of opinion that the artisans and labourers have a very large assortment of houses and rooms to choose from, and in these days of rampant Unionism are in no degree at the mercy, as alleged, of the house landlords.

The great evil of the modern dwellings is that they are more or less frauds, being jerry-built and scamped from cellar and drains to roof and chimnies. If the agitators would get a practicable measure passed to stop these miserable erec-

tions, they would do far more good than by bearing false witness against landlords and property-owners. Very many of the London houses let in lodgings are regulated under the Sanitary Act, 1866. The facilities which this system gives the local authority for obtaining penalties when such houses are faulty, are well illustrated by a prosecution, by the Bermondsey vestry, of the owner of a house who had permitted overcrowding. In this case the magistrate fined the defendant 40s. and 2s. 6d. per day, or £7 4s. in all, with the alternative of one month's imprisonment. The question of ownership has not unnaturally been investigated, with a result that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have been accused of negligence, and, indeed, are to be subjected to prosecution. The leasehold system gives opportunities for freeholders to enforce repairs, or to remain in ignorance of the condition of their houses until the end of the leases, and the latter is usually the rule; but the moral obligation remains, and where the law can be rightly and honestly put in motion against a negligent freeholder, the sentiment of the time will give him no sympathy.

Reviews and Notices.

"SYNOPTICAL LECTURES ON THE BOOKS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE." By Donald Fraser, D.D. Two Vols. Fourth Edition. London: James Nisbet and Co.

It is a pity so good a book as this is not better. In his preface Dr. Fraser says that Archdeacon Farrar "has been so good as to say that, till he fell in with our 'Synoptical Lectures,' he 'did not know of any volume of sermons, either in Patristic, Scholastic, Reformation or post-Reformation theology, which contains a series of discourses dealing *seriatim* with the 'Messages of the Books.' The idea originally occurred to us from observing how much the popular conceptions in religion rest on fragmentary sentences, used as 'texts,' and how little has been done to show, either to the clergy or the laity, the comprehensive sweep of revelation."

To say the truth, we think Dr. Fraser's volume is at least as good, not to say better, than Archdeacon Farrar's "Messages of the Books"; we prefer Dr. Fraser's style; he is fair and open-minded, and he indulges in no fulminations on unfortunate ecclesiastics. But in one or two ways Dr. Fraser's book might have been improved. It suffers, for one thing, from inequality of treatment.

The lectures seem, originally, to have been sermons; they are all pretty much of the same length, and therefore (except that the Book of Psalms has two, and the Revelation has four lectures respectively allotted to them) all the books, both of the Old Testament and New Testament canon, are treated as if all were of equal importance. This we think an error. Surely St. John's Gospel is of more importance (and deserves therefore fuller treatment) than the Song of Solomon; surely the prophecies of Isaiah contain infinitely more that is of permanent value than the Epistle of Jude. Hence the Lectures on the longer Books are but bare

outlines; while those on the shorter, are but the original elongated.

Again, we wish, in the New Testament, Dr. Fraser had lectured on St. Paul's Epistles, not in the purely arbitrary order in which they stand both in the Authorised and Revised Versions, but in the order in which they were, or in which he thinks they were, written. He could then have pointed out the course of development of particular doctrines which the varying needs of churches called forth; an important element in teaching which Dr. Fraser has somewhat neglected.

And once again, we think the purely hortative passages, which the conventionalities of preaching require in every sermon, might well have been omitted when the Lectures were published. We say, the conventionalities, for *reason* is wholly against requiring every sermon to do something towards rousing slumbering sinners. We wish preachers would remember their office is also to teach—the immortal Mr. Tozer was quite right in liking a “coarse,” for that is the only possible way of teaching an ordinary congregation, and if it be a long course, let it be broken and resumed; but the “rousing” element is just as much out of place in a teaching sermon as the teaching element is in a “rousing” sermon.

We give high praise for the fair and open way in which “difficulties” are dealt with. One half our “difficulties” are caused either by the ignorance or else by the cowardice of preachers who in the former case cannot, and in the latter dare not speak plainly. Dr. Fraser discusses, for instance, the authorship of the Book of Ecclesiastes most sensibly; he takes the late authorship view, and yet he is so clear that only the hopelessly stupid can be confused. We wish more would follow so excellent an example. The average man would then, instead of being puzzled by the manufactured objections of flippant writers like Professor Huxley, be able to rate that smart gentleman and such as he at their true value, and would hold his own views more firmly because they were something better than the merely crudities of what popularly passes muster for orthodoxy. In fine, Dr. Fraser's book is an example for preachers—not, indeed, written for servile imitation, but for adaptation, either by amplification or simplification, to the needs of particular congregations.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I am acquainted with the works of Locke, and I sometimes refer to Johnson's Dictionary. Johnson defines demonstration as the strongest degree of proof. Mr. Donaldson thinks it safe to follow Locke, which it is. But it is not safe to follow him half way and then leave him. The quotation from Locke in the letter in to-day's PULPIT consists of two clauses. Mr. Donaldson, in his letter in the PULPIT of 9th November, quotes the first clause as defining *demonstration*. He now amends his quotation, adding the second clause, in the “plainly and clearly perceived,” of which the definition resides. It is interesting that this second clause is one of the examples given by Johnson to illustrate his definition.

Mr. Donaldson gives an example of what he calls a demonstration in the form of a syllogism, and asks where is the flaw? The flaw is in the enunciation of the first premiss, which should stand:—All God's declarations are true; and Mr. Donaldson's interpretations of them are correct. I said in my former letter that I am not interfering in the discussion between your two correspondents. But Mr. Donaldson must surely know that when other declarations of Scripture can be cited, the intimations in which are inconsistent, or may with some reason be considered inconsistent with his reading of certain passages, it is out of place to be so exceedingly positive as he is.

I spoke in my former letter, not of “a conclusion derived from proof,” but of a conclusion derived from facts and their relations. I spoke also of proof being built upon evidence. But this does not mean that evidence is proof, for that would imply that the structure is the same as that upon which it rests.

The question is asked me, who told me that *ἐλεγχος* has no exact English equivalent? I learned it, first, from Liddell and Scott; and now I learn it from Mr. Donaldson, who, unable to suggest an exact English equivalent, gives four definitions all different. I may be deficient in a sense of humour, but I really do not see how it is more amusing to define *ἐλεγχος* as something between evidence and proof, compounding part of what belongs to both, than to define a youth as something between a man and a boy.

If Mr. Donaldson says that a syllogism is itself a demonstration or a proof, and not the form wherein such may be put, I apprehend that he will not find his contention receive much acceptance. As for Bishop Butler's works, none of them certainly is professedly a treatise on Logic; but more logic is to be learned from them than from all that John Stuart Mill ever wrote. If Mr. Donaldson can syllogistically prove that the whole is greater than its part, without assuming the matter to be proved in one or other premiss, or without what is called reasoning in a circle, he will do what I believe has never been yet done.

I do assert, or maintain, that man has an animal or psychical understanding, of the same kind as the understanding, commonly called in its lower manifestations *instinct*, of the lower animals, and that man has also a spiritual understanding, a faculty which the lower animals have not. This is not new. It may not in a doctrine have been familiar to Reid; it certainly is to Herbert Spencer, and was to Sir William Hamilton and Dean Mansel. It is the foundation, indeed, of Coleridge's Christian philosophy; and I believe (my knowledge of this is second-hand) that it is an essential part of the Kantian system. It has higher authority than all these. Of which of the lower creatures is it said that God breathed into their nostrils the breath of life, and that they became living souls?

I am not an Hebraist, nor have I a copy of the Septuagint to refer to at the moment, and I do not know what word in Isaiah i. 18 is rendered in our Bible by *reason*; but I am convinced that it would not bear to be translated *argue*. *διαλεγόμενον*, in Acts xxiv. 25, does not mean *arguing*;* it means *discussing*. When our translators rendered it “he reasoned,” they do not mean that St. Paul reasoned after a logical method.

I suppose that there is no necessity for me to enter on any defence of St. Paul for using the term *δοῦλος* to describe the form in which our Lord took human

nature upon Him, although Mr. Donaldson appears to think it utterly incongruous. In concluding this too long letter, may I say that I hope, in case your correspondent shall think proper to remark on it, he will abstain from attributing barefacedness to me, if he can conscientiously so abstain.

B.

14th December.

THE REVIEW OF CANON RAWSTORNE'S PAPER.

SIR,—Will you allow me to remark on a sentence or two in this review?

"Mr. Rawstorne does not stop there. He points out with irresistible force that Christ Himself gave us, as the test of pretension to a divine mission, not a genealogy of prelates consecrated by prelates, but the single principle, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'" Does this mean that a mission, even from Presbyters or a Methodist body, is needless? and that any Plymouth who leads a blameless life, and can point to his hearers, can defy the word, "No man taketh this office on himself"? I can draw no line. The review goes on: "The writer urges, with much pungency, that the loss of organic unity is not an evil, but a good." Why, then, do we pray against schism? Will it be pretended that schism is merely a division *in* a Church, but that, as soon as it blossoms into a separation, it becomes harmless, nay, beneficial? Was not the unity, prayed for by our Saviour, an outward unity that the world could judge of? Would the world, or do Romanists, call that a unity which divides the Protestant world into dozens of sects, refusing to communicate together?

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE Society for the Propagation of the Gospel held last Wednesday their annual meeting in the Corn Exchange, Oxford. Great pains had been taken this year to make the meeting successful, and the efforts were crowned with a fair measure of success. The room, though not crowded, was fairly full, and the meeting seemed interested by the speeches delivered. The Bishop of Reading, who presided, said that it was under the consideration of the standing committee of the society to introduce some reforms in the organisation for collecting subscriptions in the different dioceses, so as to bring the claims of the society more distinctly and more generally before the public. The rich seemed to him more backward than the poor in contributing to the cause of Missions, and this was he thought, a matter which called for amendment. The other speakers were the Bishop in Corea, and Mr. Cust, Hon. Secretary of the Asiatic Society.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armstrong, Rev. W. D. H., Senior Assistant-Curate to the Parish Church of Hammersmith and in Charge of St. Mark's Mission Church; Rector of Ilchester, Somersetshire.

Boycott, Rev. William Douglass, Rector of Whiteacre Burgh, otherwise Burgh St. Peter, Norfolk.
Browne, Rev. Alfred Tilleman, M.A., Curate of Reculver, Herne Bay; Rector of Postling, near Hythe.
Clutson, Rev. Arthur Davies, M.A.; a Missionary of the Society of St. Andrew, Diocese of Salisbury.
Coates, Rev. Allan, M.A., Rector of Barsham, Suffolk.
Cooper, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Nicholas-cum-St. Rumwald, Colchester.
Cox, Rev. Samuel, Vicar of St. Martin-at-Palace, Norwich.
Coyle, Rev. Dennis, M.A., Rector of Raydon, Suffolk.
Davies, Rev. Arthur Charles, B.A., Rector of Antingham, and Vicar of Thorpe Market, Norfolk, on his own petition.
Freer, Rev. S. C., M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Ghent, Rev. T., B.A., Precentor of Hobart Town Cathedral.
Grier, Rev. Alfred, B.A., Senior Curate of Frodsham, Cheshire; Vicar of Tilston, Fearnall, Cheshire.
Hocking, Rev. John Hocking, M.A., Vicar of Debenham, Suffolk; Rector of Copdock, Ipswich.
Howson, Rev. F., Vicar of Christ Church, Chester; Acting Chaplain of the 1st Cheshire and Carnarvonshire Volunteer Artillery.
Hudson, Rev. William Clark, M.A., Licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Jervis, Rev. John, Curate-in-Charge of Hagworthingham, Lincolnshire.
Jones, Rev. John Watkiss, Vicar of St. James's, West Bromwich.
Mathias, Rev. James Charles Stewart, Rector of Theberton Suffolk.
Orde-Powlett, Rev. E., M.A., Vicar of Eye, Leominster; Vicar of Kingsclere, Newbury.
Parr, Rev. R. E., M.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Stockton-on-Tees; Vicar of St. James's, West Hartlepool.
Warneford, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Salterhebble; Honorary Canon in Wakefield Cathedral.
Whitley, Rev. H., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Wakefield; Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Wakefield.
Williams, Rev. W., Vicar of St. Mary's, Traiangles, Llywel.
Winning, Rev. W., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. John's, Hopwood, Heywood.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Arrowsmith, Rev. Robert, of Fillongley, near Coventry, at Bologna, on the 6th inst., aged 66.
Carter, Rev. Albert, Curate of Long Eaton, accidentally drowned at Long Eaton, Nottingham, on the 10th inst., aged 41.
Cole-Hamilton, Rev. Arthur Henry, Rector of Castle Ashby, on the 15th inst., aged 43.
Hansell, Rev. Henry, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and eldest son of the late Henry Hansell, Esq., of the Cathedral Close, Norwich, suddenly, on the 12th inst.
Hoare, Rev. Edward Henry, Vicar of Lund-with-Kilnwick, at Lund Vicarage, Hull, on the 11th inst.
Howard, Rev. Francis George, M.A., at 1, Harvey-road, Cambridge, on the 11th inst., aged 46.
Law, Rev. Robert Arbuthnot, Rector of Gunthorpe-cum-Bale, on the 11th inst., aged 47.
Mellish, Rev. W. J., at the Rectory, Winestead, on the 14th inst., aged 60.
Palmer, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Camb., formerly University Browne Scholar, at Palmer House, Torrington, on the 14th inst., aged 89.
Pattenden, Frederick William, M.A., of New College, Oxford, and of the Inner Temple, barrister, youngest son of the Rev. Canon Pattenden, LL.D., Vicar of Chertsey, on the 9th inst., aged 32.
Roberts, Rev. Richard Earnshaw, for twenty-eight years Rector of Richmond, Yorkshire, Hon. Canon of Ripon Cathedral, and Rural Dean of West Richmond, Yorkshire, at Richmond Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 88.
Saxton, Rev. Charles Waring, D.D., of Christ Church, Oxford, at The Elms, Shrewsbury, on the 15th inst., aged 83.
Tyndale, Rev. Edmund Francis Guise, Vicar of New Shoreham, very suddenly, on the 11th inst.
Vaughan, Thomas Browne, Rector of Heapham-with-Upton, at Heapham Rectory, near Gainsborough, on the 14th inst., aged 51.
Willan, Francis Miles, M.A., fifty-five years Vicar of the parish, at Aubourn, Lincolnshire, on the 6th inst., aged 85.



The Church of England Pulpit.

ABSOLUTION.

BY THE BISHOP OF DERRY.

ABSTRACT OF SERMON PREACHED IN DERRY CATHEDRAL ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 9TH, 1889.

"Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity."—PSALM xxxii. 1, 2.

AT the close of an exposition of the text his Lordship said he wished to refer to three points. The first was that the article "I believe in the forgiveness of sins" was given in a fuller form in the Nicene Creed—"I believe in one baptism for the remission of sins." And this connection of baptism with the remission of sins was, the preacher pointed out, justified by the language of Scripture. We had Peter saying "Repent and be baptised everyone of you, and ye shall receive the kingdom of the Holy Ghost." And again to Saul, "Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins." Baptism stood out visibly as the great ceremonial and material declaration of the possibility of pardon, even for the youngest. But this idea of baptism for the remission of sins did not complete the whole of the case, nor meet the need of all our sins. It was sometimes said that belief in the gift of baptism—belief in the pardon of the sin in which we are born, and in such blessing as an infant is capable of receiving—is an opiate that dulls the conscience. With regard to that his lordship said he had never yet found the man who believed in the efficacy of baptism to entitle him to acceptance with God after a life of sin. Never, as a parochial minister standing again and again beside sick beds, had he come into contact with a soul who believed that his baptism availed him aught without personal religion. It was the other way rather—the danger was of people taking the view of baptism that having sinned against such privileges forgiveness might not be open to them. His Lordship's second point, which, he said, it was important to recollect in these days of excited religion, was that it was not to be supposed that after one initial spasm of repentance there was no more need of repentance. This was a mistake, an error far more deadly, he believed, than many that were much more talked about. Having dwelt shortly on this point, the preacher said, in the last place, he was thankful for the witness which the Church gives of the forgiveness of sins. He put the case of someone coming

Vol. XXVIII.—No. 731.

into one of their services, perhaps feeling anxious about the state of his soul, and wanting to know about the forgiveness of sins, and he asked what effect the whole service might have upon such a man. First of all, it might be too fanciful to suppose that in passing the very font itself and looking at it he might be reminded of the forgiveness of sins—that we are baptised unto the remission of sins. If that were a little fanciful, let him go a little further. The service begins, and the person hears the Absolution read from the desk. Now the General Confession and the Absolution corresponding to it—as a ceremony in public service it was absolutely unique. All who come in confess their sins; to all who use that Confession rightly a declaration of God's pardon is made. He who hath authorised His ministers "to declare and pronounce to His people being penitent the Absolution and Remission of their sins"—He, we are told, "pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel." Were there any words conceivable more calculated to give that man the instruction and assurance which he wanted. Then, again, there were the lessons at the lectern. People talked about Scriptural services. His Lordship asked where in all the Churches of Christendom there was any public service in which the very Word of God was more honoured than it was in their own? Then there was a lesson from the Old Testament and a lesson from the New. Not only were there lessons from the Scripture, but they had the psalms and canticles, the epistle and the gospel. In short, if the Scriptural part—the part in which the Scripture was read—were excised from their service it would be a short service indeed. Thus did the Church bear witness to the great sufficiency of the Holy Scripture. There were communions in which the Scripture, except in the briefest form, was hardly ever read, and only with explanations, as if the Scripture was too weak to totter without the help of an expository hand. Again, they had the Holy Communion. Every Sunday of the Christian year, and on not a few week-days, the Holy Communion was administered in that cathedral. Now, what was that Holy Communion? It was the commemoration of the sacrifice of pardon before God and before man. No true member of their Church believed that there was a chemical change, or that the substance of the bread and wine changed. But those sacred symbols became changed in use; they were the means of conveying to the faithful soul all the benefits of Christ's body broken and of Christ's blood shed for us. Then, again, they had the pulpit. His Lordship did not believe there were more sermons delivered in any church in the city, or almost elsewhere, than there were in that cathedral, and he believed in none was Christ more exalted, and in none were people more plainly taught about their duty—about the Lord's things, about acceptance of God and peace with Christ.

Speaking for myself, continued the Bishop, now for twenty-one years—for several years from this pulpit, and for many years before it from another and a humbler pulpit—it has fallen to my lot to preach amongst you the Word of God and of Christ crucified. Errors, sins, blots—many of these one may find, but in youth with passion and enthusiasm. And now, when I am older, it has been my pleasure as well as my duty to preach to you Christ crucified—now in age I am called upon, though it may be with trembling hands, to lift up the cross and tell you of the forgiveness of sins. My encouragement is the fulness and freeness of the Gospel which my Church commissions me to preach. I do not offer a limited salvation to a very few; I tell you of One who was crucified for the sins of the whole world, and who offers that atonement to every soul of man. I have never wished, proceeded his Lordship, to preach controversial sermons from this pulpit, least of all have I ever intended to speak of controversy between those who in many respects should be united, and who certainly in some respects are agreed, and if I say this, believe me, it is not from any sense of fear. I am not afraid of arguments which I have read again and again for the last forty years. I am afraid of pride; I am afraid of hatred; I am afraid of jealousy. Pride and jealousy write many sermons, and the devil, among other employments, is a great writer of controversial sermons that spread hatred between brethren. The time for fulfilling my account is coming near, and when I am gone—I suppose I have preached about 800 sermons in this cathedral, and I cannot expect to preach a great many more; but I would rather be remembered, if remembered I am, as a man who did one kindly action or spoke one tender word than a man who delivered arguments that most completely smashed an adversary, or epigrams that rankled in his heart and gave him pain. The ministry of the cross of Christ is a glorious thing; the ministry of self-advertisement is the meanest and most contemptible employment that can possibly be conceived. The Bishop concluded with some remarks in reference to the assuming of the eastward position—in which the minister, at the close of the sermon, turned away for a moment from the people, and assumed an attitude that seemed as directly turning towards God. Very simple things were sometimes very much misconstrued, and he believed some people thought that this change of attitude—not a very important thing in itself, God knows—was a piece of superstition. Were there not some such things as superstitions of the heart? Not long ago he observed a woman, beginning to be stricken in years, on a wet winter day, outside a church in which he had held a confirmation, laying some flowers reverently on the tombstone of her husband, a practice which she had continued, wet or shining, every Sunday since her bereavement. What good did the flowers do her or her dead husband? It was because there was a

superstition of the heart, and that somehow most of us think there is a beautiful weakness and a beautiful strength in human affection. They had read the history of Daniel, and how the prophet went up to his chamber and opened the window, even at the risk of the people, and prayed towards Jerusalem. The anti-ceremonialists assembled (riotously, as the word in the original expressed), and might they not have argued that the prophet was superstitious, that Jerusalem was a long way off, and that, as a matter of fact, the prophet had gone the length of the flight of stairs further from Jerusalem by ascending to his chamber. They remembered also the grand old prayer of Solomon when the Jews were exiled that if any of them turned to pray towards His holy temple He would hear them. Jonah, too, in spirit turned towards God's holy temple down in those blackest depths, and so when the minister turned towards the east—turned towards God after speaking to the people, God was not nearer to him by a single inch than He was before, but He was drawn nearer to God in the sanctuary of his own heart and his own imagination. And the minister should be encouraged to do so, for depend upon it that he would always preach best who preached as if he looked upon the face of God. And so, concluded his Lordship, I look eastward because I believe in the forgiveness of sin. I look eastward because at this solemn season of Advent the Church looks for the coming of our Lord, because I believe in the coming of the day when the very sun in heaven shall be everlastingly darkened by the brightness of the glory of His face upon whom we shall look, when, in the words of that lovely and loved anthem we heard to-night, "sorrow and sighing shall flee away," and when we shall no longer believe in the forgiveness of sin, but have it in our heart for ever and ever, in the presence of Him who has won pardon for us.



THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY THE REV. W. DONE BUSHELL, M.A.,
ASSISTANT MASTER IN HARROW SCHOOL.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE SCHOOL CHAPEL,
HARROW, ON THE 2ND SUNDAY IN ADVENT,
DECEMBER 8TH, 1889.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."—
2 TIMOTHY iii. 16.

A LETTER from home! What a help it is! There may be some perhaps to whom it means but little, but for the great majority I do not doubt that the home life with its affections and its hopes and its forgivenesses does form a very helpful background to the sterner and more resolute life of school. Without it the school life would not be what it is; it would be weakened, shorn of its most sustaining motives, and its most coveted

rewards. What will they say at home? That is a question which has ere now saved many a young life from shame, and many a mother's heart from sorrow.

Now I propose to speak to you to-day about the Bible. It is the subject which the day presents to us; and what I ask you first of all to observe is this, that in it you may hear a voice from home. Whatever I might say of the absorbing import of the salvation it reveals, whatever of the wondrous rhythm of its outward form, whatever of what in old time it has done, or, please God, shall hereafter do, yet first of all I would desire that you should understand that you may hear in it a living Father's voice which speaks to you from home. "From home," for as the Father is in heaven, there therefore is our home; and thence it is He pleads with us so earnestly, so sternly sometimes, and yet withal so lovingly, that He may save our souls alive. What will my father or my mother think of it? This thought does come to a boy to his great help when he may chance to feel the shame of his own wickedness, or it may be the imperfection of his best efforts. What will the Heavenly Father think of it, my life, my wilfulness, my sinfulness? How many there are to whom this thought would come, yes, and does come with saving power as in the quiet of their rooms they read His message to their souls!

Therefore the first, and I suppose for us the most important characteristic of the Bible is, that in it there is a living voice which speaks from God to man, a voice which speaks in it as in no other book, as by no other human agency. And this of course is true, not for you only, but for all. The mourner goes back to his silent home where he shall never hear again the voice he loved of old; and yet there comes to him another voice, a living voice, which speaks to him not in the past but in the present tense: "I am the Resurrection and the Life." The world has been too hard for some one of its weaker ones—and it may be a very hard world though you know it not—some long-tried sufferer, some sorely-troubled mother, some poor Irish cottager, and in his helplessness and his obscurity he also hears a living voice, not in the past but in the present tense, though verified indeed by the experience of the nineteen centuries, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden."

And why does this thought, that of the Bible, come to us to-day at all? It is because it is the Advent time; and on this Sunday and the next our thoughts are turned to the two main channels through which we hear His voice, to whom the souls under the altar are still crying, "Lord, how long." Two channels, that is to say, the Bible and the Church. Now our faith is not founded on the Bible, but on Jesus Christ. Nor is the Bible the foundation even of the Church, it is the witness only to the Church. Nor do we say that we believe

the Bible, but that we believe "One Catholic and Apostolic Church." In other words, the truth is that the Bible grew up in the Church, not that the Church was organised because the Bible told men of it. There was indeed a time, and that a time of marvellous and varied energy, when as yet the Books of the New Testament had not been written at all, and had it pleased God that they should never have been written, yet I suppose that day by day we still should break the bread and pour the wine, and plead with God the sacrifice of Calvary. But doubtless we can hardly realise a Church so desolate and so impoverished, a Church in which the Master's life and death should be but mere tradition, and His sacred form scarce visible across the dimness of the centuries; for Church and Bible have in God's providence been interwoven quite inextricably one with another, and those whom God has joined together may no man put asunder. Yet this we may remember to our consolation when we are dealing with the Bible, that although we may be dealing with what is so intimate a portion of the Church's life, yet ultimately it is not on it the Church is founded, but upon Jesus Christ our living King.

But this by the way, for what I ask you to observe in the second place is this, that in the Church the Bible has been given to us, that we through patience and the comfort of it and the message of it may have hope, now whilst our eyes see not as yet "the flaming of Christ's Advent feet." A letter from home! It comes perchance from India, and from a father who may not return for years; and it is therefore the more highly to be prized. So with the Bible. It is to us a Book beyond all other books, in that in it as in no other book the Church, now in the time of this her desolation, hears a living voice of warning and of encouragement. And what has that voice not done for us? My friends, if any man shall speak to you of it with miserable flippancy or yet more miserable patronage, remember, I beseech you, that to that majestic Book it has been given as to no other book to fashion noble lives, to satisfy the burning love of eager souls, to change the destinies of nations, and to sustain the drooping faith of Christendom as it awaits the coming of the Lord.

And by this time you may have understood that although I have not used the word, yet that in what I have said of the living voice of God, I have been speaking of the inspiration predicated of the older portions of the Bible in my text.

Can we assert then that there is a special inspiration in the Bible? Doubtless, it seems to me, we can. But at the same time I would also ask, if every writer and if every the most ordinary preacher who reveals God's will to any human soul, has not in his degree some special inspiration from the Holy One? He will sit down to think on what he has to say. The thought comes to his

bidding. Whence does it come? If there be any truth, if there be any value in it, comes it think you of his own poor self, or of the Holy Spirit of God? He knows not, even as I suppose St. Paul knew not how far there was in him the mind of Christ.

But if so you may ask perhaps in what way was St. Paul inspired as other men are not? At least in this way, I suppose, in that there was in him as there is not in ordinary men, however saintly or however learned, such an insight into the ways of God with men, such an understanding of the inner meaning of the redemptive work of Christ, that we can say at once: "This is of God if it be true at all, no man could have taught him this; it is inspired or it is baseless." We do not only ask what pen could, without special help from God, have written his triumphant psalm of victory over death; we do not only ask what pen could otherwise have written that inimitable Christian masterpiece, the praise of Charity; we do ask this, but even more than this, we ask who, save the Holy Spirit, could have revealed to him his characteristic Gospel of a free acceptance of a Saviour's pardoning love; who told him, save the Holy Spirit, of the eternal pre-existence, of the ascended glory of his Lord; who, of the splendid destiny of these our mortal bodies? No, we doubt not that in his soul there brooded in a very special way the Eternal Spirit, wise and prolific, even He who brooded at the first upon the face of the dark waters. But saying this, we do not define what inspiration is. Indeed, can any man do that? We may define the earthly, who shall define the heavenly? We can define a circle or a square, but there are things we rather feel than fully understand. Of such are faith, hope, charity, and of such well may be the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures? Who can deny that good men have in the Bible ever heard, as in no other book, God's voice; yet who may say how far exactly and with what limitations He was pleased to speak of old unto the fathers by the prophets?

One further question. Is the Bible free, by virtue of its inspiration, from all taint of error? No; this does not follow. True that good men, nay, that whole churches have so thought. But were they justified in thinking so? The Bible is what as a matter of fact we find it is, not what we possibly might have supposed that it would be. And therefore if there are those, as there are many, who doubt for instance whether the details of the Exodus or of the Flood, or even of the Gospel of St. John, are true to history; or whether we may trust the writer, say, of the Books of Chronicles as we have learned to trust St. Paul, let them be right or wrong, and certainly we shall not lightly part with the traditional belief of centuries as if it was a little thing, or ours to give away at will; yet none may say that there is some authoritative theory of inspiration which can prejudice such questionings, if only they be made, not in the captious spirit of

the mere critic, but lovingly and reverently, and in humility, and self-distrust.

And is it for the better or the worse that there are questions such as these? Perhaps we need not care to ask. The only point is, is it so? But if, in this our day, the Church is being guided in this matter to a truer view by Him Who is the Spirit of Truth, then doubtless for the better. But what is a very similar question has been asked, and has been answered long ago in reference to God's providential dealings with the human race. Would it not, men have asked, be better, nay, more worthy of Him, that what is right should have been so clear, should as it were have been so written with a pen of fire upon the heavens, that no man could by any possibility go wrong? And what is answered is, that man is free, and freedom must imply the possibility of sin; and further, that such discipline tries men and strengthens them and purifies them. So with the Bible. There is a blessing resting even on uncertainty. It has become a touchstone now to try men as it has never tried men heretofore. It is more easy now for shallow self-deceit to put it upon one side, to say, "This is not true in it, or that, and therefore it is not the voice of God at all; I will have none of it:" whilst, on the other hand, to search the Scriptures has become a task which now demands a purer insight, and a more resolute sincerity than heretofore; and in direct proportion as this is so does that sacred search bring with it a higher blessing to all who undertake it humbly and yet fearlessly, with wisdom yet with reverence, not greatly caring as I think for the delight of literary criticism, but with a man's resolve that when the pearl is found—that pearl of price, which is none other than God Himself revealed in Jesus Christ—they for their part will sell all that they have of wilfulness, of self-conceit, and of self-pleasing, and with a humble, loving, self-surrender pay that price which can alone avail to buy it for their own.

But your temptation is not self-conceit, irreverence, or doubt, so much as sheer neglect. How many let the days pass by them with the word of God unread except in School-hours or at household prayer? How few there are, I fear, who read it in the quiet of their rooms with regularity and prayer? And yet how much we lose when we thus suffer play or work to cut us off from God! Let me remind you of the well-known story of the great Augustine. Whilst yet a young man he was weeping as he tells us in the most bitter contrition of his heart, when "lo!" he goes on to say, "I heard from a neighbouring house a voice, as of boy or girl, I know not, chanting, and oft-repeating, *Tolle lege, Tolle lege*. 'Take up and read, Take up and read.' So checking the torrent of my tears I arose, interpreting it to be no other than a command from God to open the Book and read. I seized, opened, and in silence read that section on which my eyes first fell"—they were the words you

heard last Sunday in the Epistle—"Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying, but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof." No further," he adds, "would I read, nor needed I; for instantly at the end of this sentence, by a light as it were of serenity infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt vanished away."

My friends, have we no need of a *Tolle lege, Tolle lege*? Surely it is as true as ever that it is to them who knock to whom the door is opened, that it is by them who search the Scriptures that they may hear the Father's message to their souls, the still small voice is heard which, in however varying accents, tells of Him to man.

THE JOY OF HARVEST.

BY J. W. KAYE, RECTOR.

A HARVEST THANKSGIVING SERMON, PREACHED IN DERRYBRUSK PARISH CHURCH ON NOVEMBER 17TH, 1889.

"They joy before thee according to the joy in harvest."—ISAIAH ix. 3.

JOY is said to have three stages: first, that of hope; second, that of possession; and third, that of remembrance. To-day, as Christians, we rejoice in the possession of a God-given harvest. We publicly profess our faith in God and in His over-ruling Providence. We acknowledge Him to be the Omnipotent Creator and Sustainer of the universe; "God that made the world and all things therein, Lord of heaven and earth" (Acts xvii. 24).

The circling seasons, as they move in majesty along the zodiac of their countless years, repeat the universal chorus of "the morning stars," when God but breathed the thought and spake Creation into being. They tell us in sublimest strains of radiant starry depths, the vast Creation's glory, and of Him the Eternal One, whose sovereign word is law, whose power is paramount, whose wisdom is inscrutable, and whose boundless goodness ever crystallises into love. This is our God, whom we magnify for His mercies, and to whom we offer the thanksgiving of our hearts for His bountiful harvest. This is our heavenly Father, who "maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust"; and who to the generations of men "left not Himself without a witness, in that He did good and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with gladness" (Acts xiv. 17).

From the earliest ages, when men began to till the ground and reap the God-given produce, they have ever and anon turned away from the ordinary toils of the day to give expression to the gratitude

of their souls to God for His blessings bestowed upon them. When Noah offered his sacrifice of thanksgiving for his marvellous deliverance, "the Lord smelled a sweet savour," and the promise was graciously given "that seed time and harvest, summer and winter, shall not cease" (Gen. viii. 21). This promise of God assures us of the certainty of the return of the various seasons and the accompanying harvest time as long as the world shall last.

The feast of Harvest was an appointed time for thanksgiving and rejoicing among the agricultural Jews. Such times of thanksgiving and joy have their foundation in the purposes of God and in the very nature of things. As we are dependent upon God for every blessing we receive, it is in the very nature of things our bounden duty to render unto Him our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for His bountiful gifts. We perceive, therefore, without further introduction, that the joy of harvest is—

I. THE JOY OF THANKFULNESS.—In all ages and in all nations where agriculture has been adopted, "the joy of the harvest" has become a proverbial expression, signifying the joy and gratitude of the people, that in the Providence of God they have again been enabled to reap the fruits of another harvest. Even the savage tribes of the deserts are declared by travellers to teach and cultivate assiduously the spirit of thankfulness and gratitude for benefits received; and the neglect of this duty is considered a punishable offence. Old Isaac Walton used to say that "God has two dwellings—one in heaven and one in the meek and thankful heart." And day by day the thankful soul finds mercies and blessings on every hand, which call forth the expression of joy and gratitude to Him who is the Giver of "every good and perfect gift." The poet Spenser says that "thankfulness is the tune of the angels." And if the cherubim and seraphim who stand around the eternal throne for ever chant their songs of praise with loud thanksgivings to His holy name, how much more shall we, frail mortals of the dust, pour forth our heartfelt gratitude, for daily mercies undeserved and bounteous harvests given. The language of St. Paul to the Colossians is, "Whatever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God by Him" (Col. iii. 7.) Again he says to the Ephesians, "Be filled with the spirit; giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Ephes. v. 20.) Let us be assured then that thanksgiving is a necessary Christian duty. It is true that in our harvest thanksgiving services we are more especially honouring God in His over-ruling Providence; but we must not forget to honour Him as the God of pardoning grace. What more blessed, what more acceptable worship can we offer unto the God of infinite benevolence, through our Lord Jesus Christ, than the sacrifice

of praise and thanksgiving from a humble and contrite heart. And what choicer blessing can we have than the blessing of a thankful heart; for it is written, "whoso offereth praise, glorifieth Me" (Ps. i. 23).

The more our hearts are filled with the joy of thanksgiving, the less shall we be crushed by the sorrows of life and the more we shall rejoice in the sun-light of eternal love. But the joy of harvest is also—

II. THE JOY OF CONFIDENCE.—The promise of God is that "summer and winter, day and night, seed-time and harvest, shall not cease" so long as the world endures to us. We have had a life-long experience of the fulfilment of this promise, and our fathers for generations past have experienced the same blessing, and so we have confidence in God. This confidence expresses our firm assurance and trust in the faithfulness of God. We rely upon Him, and our souls cling with expectation, which has never been disappointed. And thus the joy of harvest is to us the joy of confidence. But he who has this joyous confidence in God hopes and expects for the future; for confidence begets expectation. But though God may give a general promise of blessing to the world at large, yet He is not under an obligation to give the blessing of prosperity to every man in the world. Yet he does say, "According to your faith be it unto you" (Matt. ix. 29.) And God at times sees fit to try our faith. He sometimes makes us to pass through seasons of sorrow, temptations, and disappointments, and sometimes He sends pestilence and famine. It may be pride and fulness in a nation that He will punish; it may be the sin of lust and sloth, or of carelessness, neglect, and contempt of the commandments of God among a people that He will chastise. Yet in the midst of the scourging of nations the true Christian has the assurance of his heavenly Father's care. He who feeds the birds of the air will feed and clothe His hoping, trusting, loving children—"For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things" (Matt. vi. 32).

Thus it is that the godly man nourishes in his breast the joy of hope and the assurance of trusting and confiding love. By the keen eye of faith he looks, as it were, into the soul of God and beholds that omnipotent tenderness and grace that will not leave nor forsake one of the least of His little ones. The godly man feels and knows that all the trust and confidence of men is nothing in comparison with the infinite and immutable veracity and faithfulness of God. God's gracious promises are centered in His glorious perfections. And faith in the nature and character of God, as revealed in His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, fills the Christian's soul with confidence and courage, and banishes the gloom of doubt and despondence.

There was blessed joy in the confidence of St. Paul when he could say—"I know Whom I have

believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day" (2 Tim. i. 12). May we have a joyful confidence in God, both for His spiritual and temporal blessings.

The joy of harvest is also—

III. THE JOY OF ENCOURAGEMENT.—We have never laboured and tilled the ground, and sown the seed, and asked the blessing of God upon it in vain. Many have wrought and have asked no blessing, yet God has blessed their labours, unworthy and undeserving though they were. Is there not joy and encouragement in the reflection that God has blessed our harvests in the past? and is there not joy and encouragement in the assurance that He who has blessed us in the past will also bless us in the future if we ask Him? Has He not said—"Ask and it shall be given unto you"? The joy of encouragement in our hearts will be in proportion to our faith and confidence in the God of Harvests. If we are living without God and without hope in the world, what joy or encouragement can we have? If we are labouring without faith to cheer us, or hope to brighten the gloom of darkness, our lives are indeed miserable. Despondency will paralyse all our efforts, and despair will seize upon our souls, and moral and spiritual death will encompass us round about. And such must be the end of that man's life who is living in barren ignorance and contempt of God, and at enmity with the highest instincts of his own soul. But when the heart is firmly resting on the everlasting promises of God, with undoubting confidence in His eternal faithfulness, then the soul is filled with encouragement and hope. How could a Christian live without asking the blessing of God upon the labours of his hands? And if he asked no blessing from God; if he lived without prayers, what is the difference between him and the infidel? But the joy of hope and encouragement which springs from faith and confidence of God enables us to triumph over the trials and difficulties of the present, and lay hold upon the blessings of the future.

Yet the harvests of time should all remember us of the great harvest of eternity. The harvest is the end of the world, when the angel reapers shall gather the tares into bundles to burn them, but they shall gather the wheat into the garner of the Lord. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap; for he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting" (Gal. vi. 7).

And even in this the joy of harvest is the joy of encouragement; there is yet time before the harvest is fully ripe and the end come; and "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." God grant that we may be among that innumerable company,

gathered by the angel reapers, to hold an eternal harvest-home in heaven and join the mighty chorus saying, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain."

MR. REGINALD BERKELEY has been appointed Organising Secretary for the County of London of the Church of England Burial, Funeral, and Mourning Reform Association.

THE last of a series of changes which have lately been made in the examination for the Honour School of Theology at Oxford is announced in the *Gazette* this week. It relates to the examination in *Liturgia*. It provides that in 1893 there shall be under this head two alternative subjects, viz.:—1. "The History of the Liturgy of the Eucharist in both the Greek and Latin Churches," especially as exhibited in the following documents: *Apostolic Constitutions*, Books VII., VIII.; St. Cyril, *Hieros Catechesis*, XXII., XXIII.; the Liturgies attributed to St. James and St. Mark; the Liturgies of Reichenau Palimpsest; the Sacramentarium Gelasianum; the Missale Gothicum; and Mabillon, *Ordines Romani*, I. and II. 2. "The Book of Common Prayer, including the Ordinals." Candidates will be expected to show knowledge of the following:—The Sacramentarium Gelasianum, Book I., Office for Penitents, Catechumens, Baptism, Confirmation, Ordination, Book III., first part to the end of the Post-Communion Prayers; Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*; and *Monumenta Rituala*, Vol. I., the Orders of Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, the Visitation of the Sick, and Burial. As the work for the school has now been very thoroughly considered and revised, we trust that it may not be necessary for some considerable time to come to make any further changes, for it is almost as desirable that tutors and pupils should have a definite conception of the examination for which they will have to prepare, as that the examination itself should be constructed on the best possible lines. The changes which have been recently made will prove an advantage, but now the best interests of the school seem likely to be consulted, it can be left for a time to grow and develop unchanged.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

PAMPHLET and Advice

FREE

Every man and woman in search of should write without delay to **MR. C. B. HARNESS**, Consulting Medical Electrician (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his New Medical Work, entitled "**Harness' Guide to Health**," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harness' Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. **MR. C. B. HARNESS** also gives Advice (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1889.

CLEANLINESS.—No. I.

THE New as well as the Old Testament contains numerous passages enjoining personal cleanliness. Our Lord bids us to be born again of water as well as of the Spirit, and St. Paul reminds us that our bodies are the Temple of the Holy Ghost. Cleanliness, however, would be important were it only for the exhilaration and comfort which attention to it brings. This charming feeling of buoyancy, and increased comfort would in itself be ample reward enough were it the only one to make in all seasons and circumstances scrupulous attention to cleanliness an habitual care. The skin is a most complex and important organ; and comfort, good health, and the continuance of life depend on its functions being efficiently discharged. The skin, it must never be forgotten, is one of the chief excretory organs of the body. Through its minute pores, from the hour of birth to the moment of death, pass almost incalculable quantities of noxious and used-up materials. The amount is not easily ascertained, but the results of accurate experiments are startling. A moderate calculation places the excreted material in an adult at between twenty and fifty ounces daily. If the action of the skin could be entirely suspended for two days and nights, four to five pints of poisonous matter would be retained in the body, and would either terribly impair the general health or find an exit by some other channel. Life, however, could not be preserved for two days were the skin-pores hermetically closed, so that we need not discuss the consequences. Were they hermetically sealed for a few hours with wax, or plaster of Paris, or death would ensue.

So that it comes to this, that the skin must be in full working order if life and health are to be

preserved in perfection. The structure of this important organ is interesting. There is an outermost layer—dry, hard, and incapable of feeling pain; this is the epidermis, or scarf-skin. Its use is to protect the delicate and sensitive subjacent textures. Under the scarf, or outer skin, lies the mucous layer, containing the colouring matter. Underneath the mucous coat is the true skin, a marvellous and beautiful network of blood vessels and nerves, and the seat of that exquisite sense—touch. Hard manual work thickens the outermost layer, which is constantly peeling or scaling off. Soap and water remove the superfluous scarf-skin, keep the skin soft and moist and able to discharge its functions properly, and prevent the accumulation on the surface of the body of dry animal matter, unpleasant from its odour and interfering with the work the skin has to do.

Though health suffers when the skin functions are suspended, there is a beautiful compensatory relation between them and those of the kidneys—another of the principal emunctories of the body. In warm weather the skin is extraordinarily active while in cold the kidneys do double work. In hot weather, unless the pores are open to facilitate the passage of perspiration—nature's method of diminishing the exalted temperature of the system—how can one expect to enjoy the bright days of summer? Although both organs have at all times a fair share of work—though the activity of the one makes up for the sluggishness of the other—time is required for the relation, normally existing, to be safely altered, and even then both organs must continue more or less in working order. For instance, in summer the blood flows briskly to the surface of the body and the skin is unusually active; in winter the blood is chiefly found in the more internal parts and organs of the body, and the kidneys are then the great excreting organs. Should the temperature suddenly change, and a very cold day succeed a warm one, there is not time for that safe and gradual adjustment on which health depends, and a bad cold or inflammation often follows because the action of the skin is checked before the kidneys are ready for the extra work thrown upon them. Peace of mind, wholesome well-cooked food, abundance of outdoor exercise, and warmth and cleanliness of skin, all play their part in keeping the skin and the kidneys in health, and ready to assist and relieve each other in sudden changes of temperature. The inflammations and disorders that are caused by the partial suspension of the function of either or both of these great emunctories are readily explained by the fact that the internal skin, or "mucous membrane" as it is called, has in a measure to discharge the functions of these organs in addition to its own; for as a sanitary poem says:—

There's a skin without, and a skin within,
A covering skin and a lining skin;
But the skin within is the skin without,
Doubled inwards and carried completely throughout.

The palate, the nostrils, the windpipe and throat
Are all of them lined with this inner coat,
Which through every part is made to extend,
Lungs, liver and bowels from end to end.

The outside skin is a marvellous plan
For exuding the dregs of the flesh of man,
While the inner extracts from the food and the air
What is needed the waste of the flesh to repair.

Reviews and Notices.

"LABOUR AND LIFE OF THE PEOPLE." By Charles Booth. Vol. I. London: Williams and Norgate.

WE have sometimes been severe (though we could hardly be too severe) upon the politicians, sectarians, and journalists who make use of popular suffering and discontent as a vantage-ground for the promotion of personal or Party interests. We have now the pleasure of introducing to our readers a book which is absolutely unbiassed by any such mean objects. We have read it through without being able to find out, from the internal evidence, whether the author is a Conservative or a Liberal, a Churchman or a Dissenter. It is a calm and dispassionate inquiry into the condition and employments of the labouring classes in East London, on which, as the author tells us, and as is evidently true, he entered with no opinions formed, and no pet theory to recommend, and at the end of which he feels that he can only state with the greatest diffidence the views which he has formed of possible remedies for the evils which he has discovered.

Upon the whole, his view of the East End is encouraging. It is not a Sodom crowded with a shameless and dissolute population, but a district in which the larger part are orderly and industrious people, possessed of the necessary conditions of happiness, which the author holds to be "work and affection—conditions which he who works for those he loves fulfils most easily." He divides the whole population into the following classes, of which he gives an approximative estimate of the numbers:—

(A.) Loafers and semi-criminals...	11,058
(B.) Casual earnings—"very poor" ...	99,700
(C.) Intermittent earnings } together	201,818
(D.) Small regular earnings } the "poor"	
(E.) Regular standard earnings—above the line of poverty ...	368,215
(F.) Higher class labour ...	113,347
(G.) Lower middle-class ...	48,239
(H.) Upper middle-class ...	14,162

851,539

In unscheduled houses (upper class) about ...	40,000
In institutions ...	17,419

908,958

Of these, Classes E, F, G, and H are living comfortable lives, possessed of all the necessary materials of happiness; and Classes C and D, although their existence is bare, are not inadequately nourished, and are not unhappy, and would be much better off if they could be delivered from the competition of Class B, which includes the shiftless, helpless, idle, and intemperate, who prefer casual employment to regular labour, and also the weak in body, the widows with

families, and others, who are physically incapable of regular employment. Mr. Booth, therefore, proposes that the State should take charge of Class B bodily, finding them employment and providing them with subsistence. He says this is a semi-Socialist proposal; and, if we are not mistaken, he is himself conscious that it would be quite impracticable, the difficulty in the way being, not in the cost of the experiment, but in inducing or compelling these poor, thriftless members of the body politic to accept a regulated and industrious life. "There would be few," he says, "who would not tire of it, and long for the old life of hardship and vicissitude."

Mr. Booth gives a most elaborate account of the condition of all the principal trades of the East End, the evils of which seem to be caused, not by any oppression of large manufacturers, nor by diminution of wages through the deduction from them of the profits of middlemen or sub-contractors, but by the multiplication of small masters, in whose insanitary rooms many of the processes of manufacture are executed, and by the competition for work with the regular workers in Classes C, D, and E, of numbers of half-helpless people in Class B. He advocates a great extension of Government inspection with a view of amending the sanitary conditions under which work is carried on, but admits the extreme difficulty of any such thorough oversight on account of the enormous number of small workshops.

Our author estimates the influence of religion at a very low point. He does not think the population actually irreligious; indeed, they have a perfect passion for religious discussions. But the forms in which religion is presented to them seem not to suit them, and the greater part of them never go to either church or chapel. The following are some of his figures:—

Estimated population	...	...	...	909,000
Churches and Chapels—				
Morning attendance...	...	...	...	72,400
Evening " ...	...	...	...	81,648
Mission-rooms—				
Morning attendance...	...	...	...	8,458
Afternoon " ...	...	...	...	7,279
Evening " ...	...	...	...	22,853

Our space will not permit us to extend our notice, but we recommend our readers who may be interested in the condition of the people to study this book. Let them turn a deaf ear to all the shriekers, from Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone downwards, whether the object of their abuse be landlords, capitalists, or middlemen. The condition of the masses is worsened by agitation, and is still further deteriorated by spasmodic charity. The problem of improving and elevating their condition is most difficult and complicated. It can only be solved by careful investigations like that which is the subject of our present review; and even after such inquiries, and a vast accumulation of information, the best-informed persons have difficulty in indicating any remedy of existing evils which might not occasion greater evils than it cured. These questions must be approached with the calmest thought and entire absence of partisanship. We recommend Mr. Booth's book as possessing in an eminent degree these two requisites.

THE third of a series of lectures in connection with the Wesleyan Chapel, Victoria Park, Wavertree, was delivered there by the Rev. C. W. Stubbs, Rector of Wavertree, Liverpool.

"THE TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR TO EARLY CHRISTIANITY." By George T. Purves, D.D. London: James Nisbet and Co. "JUSTIN MARTYR'S APOLOGY." Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh. "THE EXPOSITOR," November, 1887. Article III., "The Didache and Justin Martyr." London: Hodder and Stoughton.

WE are quite at one with Dr. Purves in all he says about the importance of the testimony of Justin Martyr to early Christianity.

For many reasons Justin's writings are of great value. He was a man of some ability, warm-hearted, and zealous. Before his conversion he had been an earnest seeker after truth; he was a companion of philosophers and a diligent student of Plato. Dr. Purves thinks Platonism too much affected his theology. He was a great traveller, and for many years resided in Rome. His first Apology—reprinted, with Bishop Kaye's introduction from William Reeves's translation in Messrs. Griffith's excellent series—was addressed to Antoninus Pius, and begins with a bold appeal for justice, in obvious imitation of the more famous Apology of Socrates. Then, after showing the unreasonableness of hating men merely for the name they bore, Justin answers the charges of atheism, immorality, and disloyalty. Later on he speaks of Christian doctrine, especially of the Trinity, drawing both analogies and contrasts between philosophy and Christian doctrines, and afterwards describes Christian worship.

His main argument for Christ's Divinity—in the first Apology at any rate—is not Christ's miracles, nor even His resurrection, but the fulfilment of prophecy. All this, as Dr. Purves shows, throws light in many ways on the civil, social, and intellectual conditions of early Christianity. As a philosopher, Justin shows the relation of Christianity to non-Christian schools of thought—we wish, by the way, Dr. Purves would not continually speak of "pagan thought"—it is not to be supposed that he does not know the meaning of the word "pagan," but the combination is most incongruous. In his writings Justin continually makes quotations—we abstain from saying from what—and thus he becomes a witness of great value as regards the canon of the New Testament. And again, in describing Christian worship, Christian rites, and Christian organisations, he writes at sufficient length to be a most important witness as regards the various theories which the fanciful brains of Tübingen professors have formulated.

On all these points Dr. Purves writes most clearly, and very interestingly. We have enjoyed his book greatly, and think it of great value. If, therefore, our subsequent remarks are, as they mostly will be, not entirely in agreement with some of his conclusions, we hope that no one will misunderstand them, and think that they are in any way meant to detract from the high opinion we have already expressed of the fairness and ability of the writer.

Perhaps the fifth lecture, in which Dr. Purves reviews Justin's testimony to the New Testament, is the most interesting. Justin, it must be remembered, is the first post-Apostolic author whose writings are of any considerable size; therefore he is, as we have already said, a witness of the greatest importance. Four questions Dr. Purves discusses, and discusses very ably. Did Justin use any other Gospels than our four? Did he recognise the Apostolic authorship of

the Fourth Gospel? Did he recognise the authority of the Apostles? And, does he testify to the existence of a sacred Christian literature comparable with the Old Testament? Now, it is well known that Justin quotes the memoirs (τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα) very frequently. But then the question arises—a question which has been variously answered—were these our Four Gospels? The Tübingen school say, or did say, No: Dr. Purves says, Yes.

We venture to think after carefully considering his arguments, and after a careful perusal of the two other books referred to above, that not proven would be a truer answer. And we offer these reasons. We quite agree with Dr. Purves that the verbal differences between Justin's quotations and our present text of the New Testament, of which so much is sometimes made, prove little or nothing.

"In the first Apology," he says, "there are, as I reckon, thirty-six passages which may be regarded as taken from the 'Memoirs,' because either citing some instance of Christ's teaching, or relating some event of His life. But only two of these agree exactly with the language of our Gospels." We should not have been surprised if there had been none instead of only two; not only because Justin, as Dr. Purves shows, quotes the Septuagint, and even his favourite Timaeus, just as inaccurately; but still more because everything is against our expecting exact quotations.

It seems to us that those who expect *verbal* quotations are but showing that they have wholly failed to throw themselves in imagination into the conditions of things in that period. Was it likely that, when the echo of the voice of the last surviving Apostles had hardly died away—that while Christianity was very much a life and an enthusiasm, and very little, if at all, a literature and an organisation—men should care to give the words of a manuscript, provided they gave its spirit. And this is exactly what Justin does. He quotes Christ's precepts, but in any sort of combination that suits him; he shows coincidences of arguments of St. Paul—there are three very striking allusions to the speech on Mars Hill—but he makes no direct reference; he makes the same Old Testament quotations which the Evangelists made, but he never says they did so. This, we quite agree with Dr. Purves, is incomprehensible on the Tübingen theory, but it does not therefore follow that he was directly quoting our Gospels. It is too near the Apostolic age to say that certainly; just as, with all due deference to Dr. Taylor, the Didache was too near Justin, and the coincidences of language are far too slight to prove direct quotation. What we think Dr. Purves has proved is this—that there was a well defined system of catechetical instructions in the early Church, perfectly in agreement with our present Gospels, and that Justin's quotations are (in the main at any rate) in perfect harmony with that.

We should not expect to find more in any apologist who lived in Justin's time, and are quite content to find so much.

As regards Justin and the Fourth Gospel, we think Dr. Purves has understated the argument. The reference to the conversation with Nicodemus, though indirect, is so clear that it is a proof to all, except those who refuse to see it. Moreover, Justin's use of the word *Logos* for Christ implies acquaintance therewith; more, we think, than merely "a literary community of goods." And we are almost inclined to say that Justin echoes the *μονογενὴς θεός* of a reading of St. John i. 18; if so, he must have seen some manuscript of the Fourth Gospel.

One further difference we have with Dr. Purves. He often objects to Justin's theology, which he says is too much influenced by Plato, and is rationalistic. We think he forgets that there is a good deal of the theology of Alexandria in the LXX., which may have influenced Justin as well as Plato. And with all courtesy we would add that were Justin here to do so, he might in many cases make an exceedingly good defence of some of the doctrines to which Dr. Purves objects.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ST. JOHN VI.

SIR,—There is a letter signed "*Inquirens*" in your paper of 7th of this month calling attention to an old letter, said to be about six months ago, on certain expressions in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel, in the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT. The old letter referred to is not six months, but about two years, old. It starts an objection to the ordinary interpretation of our Lord's discourse in the chapter referred to, which objection, its writer says, is new. The old letter, and that in your number of the 7th of this month, are signed with the same signature, "*Inquirens*."

The writer of both these letters lays down pretty positively that "the Bread," verses 33, 35, and 48, and "the Bread," verse 51, "that I will give," are not the same. What is advanced to support this view is: "When Christ speaks of Himself, and says, 'I am the Bread of Life,' He speaks of Himself as God and Man. But when He speaks of the Bread that He will give for the life of the world, He speaks of that Human Body," etc.

It is to be observed of this, that the criticism or distinction drawn here is altogether unwarranted. The distinction is not to be drawn, or is not capable of being drawn, from anything in our Lord's discourse. Its origin is in the mind of the critic. Let any one without prepossession read verses 48 to 51 of the chapter, and he will find it impossible to imagine that there are two *Breads* spoken of. The Bread that cometh down from heaven is in verse 50, that which one may eat of and not die; and the Bread that our Lord gives, verse 51, is His Flesh, which He gives for the world's life. Our Lord here repeats the same thing in varying language; varying, however, in such manner that no one can be warranted in pronouncing that He says a different thing, or communicates different ideas, more than is implied by the use of the word *flesh* in the second or 'explanatory' saying.

The Flesh and Blood, "*Inquirens*" says, cannot stand for our Lord Himself, because they do not include His Divinity. It would be answer enough to this that they do stand for Himself, because He says that they do, identifying them as He does with the Bread, which He declares Himself to be. But "the part can never stand for or constitute the whole," says your correspondent. This is not so. The part cannot constitute the whole, but it may, and often does, stand for the whole. Man has a mind and he has a body; of both, indifferently, he speaks as "I." I am glad, I am sorry; this is of the mind. I am in good health, I am wounded; this is of the body. But the "I" includes both mind and body when a man speaks of

them in their connection; when he speaks of either distinctively, he does not of necessity draw the distinction by the use of some unknown pronoun in any language that I have ever heard of.

Follow up "*Inquirens*" reasoning, if reasoning it should be called. "Eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood may mean coming to Him and believing on Him"; and "coming to Him and believing on Him may be the same as eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood." *May mean!* and *may be the same!* Founding a serious argument to overthrow the evident intention of one of our Lord's most solemn sermons on a *may be!* And perverting our Lord's words, "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger," as if coming to Him to be fed were the same as being fed! I can understand a Quaker who rejects the sacraments talking this way, and glossing over Scriptural language; I cannot understand a Churchman, as I suppose "*Inquirens*" professes to be.

Our Lord, your correspondent says, could never say the Bread from heaven is His Flesh, for His Flesh never came down from heaven. But He did say (verse 51): "I am the living Bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever"; and He said in further exposition (verse 54): "Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal life." The fact is, your correspondent misses the whole spiritual meaning of this wonderful chapter. The last intimation given in it is, that the Son of Man should ascend where He was before, and accordingly it is the Spirit, and not the Flesh, that quickeneth or giveth life. And this Ascension of the Son of Man, in His Body, to where He was before, should, properly viewed, chase away all "difficulties" about the same Son of Man never having descended from heaven in the visible shape of man's flesh.

I was about to add to this some remarks on the curious pride that your correspondent seems to take in having started a new argument (if I understand him rightly) in favour of the Transubstantiation doctrine. His argument is not new. It is the same argument as those insinuated, who asked, "How can this Man give us His Flesh to eat?" and it is the same argument as that of the Quakers. It should not surprise any one that Cardinal Wiseman did not see its value.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

19th December, 1889.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—I will not just now examine into the many texts which "J. B." quotes and of which he says our apprehension of their truth is just so many misconceptions. I will not either, as I might very readily, reply by a *tu quoque* argument. I shall leave all that to those whom it concerns. I will only notice just so much of his letter as refers to me.

He says: "They have the cheering, loving, inspiring conviction that it is the clearly revealed purpose of God to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, holy, and happy immortality through processes of a most momentous nature, which take place during *aions* or ages."

I suppose I do "J. B." no injustice when, for clearness, I reduce his statement to these few words, God will make all men happy, by a special process, after this life. And now I shall have no difficulty in show-

ing the statement to be perfectly absurd. I hope he will kindly excuse the strong language.

(1) The statement implies that many men will depart this life unhappy. This is contrary to experience.

(2) The statement implies that many men leave this world with a desire to be made happy. This is contrary to experience.

(3) The statement implies that the Atonement has no power to make men happy. I refrain from characterising such a statement.

(4) The statement is nowhere revealed. It cannot stand even by a shadow of implication.

Now, he continues, "I understand age-long in that sense." But the statement is without sense or reason. *Ergo*, &c.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage,
Dec. 14th, 1889.

SIR,—Mr. Sandlands says, in the PULPIT of the 7th December: "Accepting the term *αἰώνιος* in the sense of *age-long* does not help the Universalist a bit. How can it, when the age which succeeds this is never-ending?"

In reply to this, let me quote from Jukes's "Names of God in Holy Scripture" (Longman, 1888), page 150: "God's perfect rest is not in the 'ages,' but beyond them, when the mediatorial kingdom, which is 'for the ages of ages' (*εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*—see Rev. xi. 15) is delivered up, and Christ, by whom all things are wrought in the ages, goes back to the glory which He had 'before the age times'" (*πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*, 2 Tim. i. 9 and Titus i. 2; translated in the Authorised, "before the world began"; in the Revised, "before times eternal").

Thus not only the "ages," but the "ages of ages," which we translate by "ever and ever," will end in the ultimate glory, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24).

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 11th December, 1889.

HOW PADDY GOT RID OF THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.

SIR,—As the Bishop of Liverpool and the Dean and Bishop of Peterborough have all plans of manipulating this Rubric, will you allow me to tell you how we succeeded with it in our Revision Synod in Ireland? Of our Irish ingenuity the world requires no proof. I need only remind your readers of what Paddy said to the priest who wanted him to restore to the widow the stolen pig. "Do you tell me," said Paddy, "that at the last day the widow and the pig will be present? Well, then I will say to the widow, 'there is your pig, take it.'" After this my story will appear tame, but such as it is you shall have it. The question before our Revision Synod was what to do with the Ornaments Rubric. Thus Alexander the Great was to untie the Gordian knot. What he did with his sword Paddy did with a ——. Och, I will not use a bad word, but tell you the story exactly as it happened. A copy of the Prayer Book was produced, purporting to be the one which came over with either Elizabeth or Charles II., but I forget which. This copy came from our Rolls Court, or some such office. Lo, and behold, the Ornaments Rubric was not in it at all.

Whether lost or torn out in the office or on the way to the Synod does not appear, and deponent saith not. The Synod decided that, as the Ornaments Rubric was not in the copy that came over with the Act, they would not admit it into our Revised Prayer Book. Now there never was a Prayer Book previously printed in Ireland without the Rubric. This was as plain as the sun in the heavens. The theory, I suppose, was that England when sending in a copy, purposely tore out the Rubric—good enough for her, but unfit for us. This is an astounding idea. But this does not complete the absurdity. I have before me a Charles II. Prayer Book, exactly, I suppose, like the one then sent over. The page, supposed to have been suppressed on the way, or lost, or put aside in our Rolls Office, has on the other side of it the rules for finding Easter, and, with the famous Rubric, "the order for Morning and Evening Prayer," &c. All this we were gravely told in the Synod were *never* in the Irish Book. *Credat Judæus!* But this is not all. I will complete my proof that the missing leaf was part of our book as it came. Your readers know what a "catchword" is at the bottom of a page corresponding to the first word on the next. The first word on the missing page is "to," the last on the one before is also "to," but the first word on that following the missing page is "the." Therefore, the missing page must have been in the book that came from England. That our Synod should have swallowed such a figment, that any one, bishop, priest, or laymen, should have got it up, passes comprehension; but it is to be matched by an equally outrageous assertion in the new preface—a falsehood as to the origin of the new question and answer foisted into the Catechism. One word as to the manipulation of the Ornaments Rubric in order to an Eirenicon. It would, if successful, only affect the performance of divine service. An Eirenicon of *belief* can be effected only by one side taking honestly the Fourth Article and the Black Rubric, which deny a corporeal adorable Presence, and by the other side taking honestly the Catechism's "Verily and indeed," which asserts a real Presence of Grace. All else is only skinning over a wound gaping beneath.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

MOUNTAIN SUMMITS.

"The heavens declare the glory of God."

HE that ascends to Etna's highest height,
With nought around but rocks and fire and snow,
Shall see the stars more numerous and more bright,
While the blue depths of heaven still deeper grow.
They seem no nearer to his straining sight
Than when he gazed upon them from below;
But far more glorious in their light they shine,
And speak more clearly of the power divine.

And so it is with those the height who climb
Of highest human knowledge; for the rays
Of the eternal glory most sublime
Seem to the eyes which from that summit gaze;
But all the mightiest mysteries of Time,
Existence, Freedom, Fate, that height displays
Not solved but deepened—an abyss of sky
Deepening and darkening as we mount on high.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

THE next examination for the Christian Evidence Scholarship for the diocese of Liverpool will take place next spring. It may be held on residence at one of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, or Durham for two years, and for a further term of one year by a candidate, otherwise duly qualified, who intends to take holy orders.

AT the Church Training College for Lay-workers, Commercial Road, E., evening classes have already been begun on three nights in each week; the subjects being Holy Scripture, Church Doctrine, and Early Church History. These are being well attended. The warden (the Rev. P. Petit) will after Christmas be joined by the Rev. A. H. Browne as sub-warden, and the course of training for resident students will then begin. Applications for residence have come from all parts of England.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barrett, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of Etruria, Staffordshire.
Broughton, Rev. F. R., M.A., Rector of Wyddial, Herts.
Churchward, Rev. M. W., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Clutterbuck, Rev. R. H., Rector of Knight's Enham; Rector of Penton Mewsey, Hants.
Cordon, Rev. S., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Wolverhampton.
Cornish, Rev. William Floyer, M.A., Rector of Winterborne Abbas-with-Steepleton, Dorset.
De Heriz, Rev. L. F. V. S., B.A., Vicar of High Ercall, Salop; Rector of St. Martin-by-Looe, Cornwall.
Guillebaud, Rev. Ernest Delabere, B.A., Rector of Yatesbury, Wilts.
Hare, Rev. Ernest Bathurst, M.A., Curate of Pickering; Vicar of Goathland, Yorkshire.
Hartley, Rev. E., M.A., East London Mission Clergyman.
Kitto, Rev. John F., M.A., Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields; Honorary Chaplain to the Queen.
Lawson, Rev. G. W., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Kensal-town.
Livesey, Rev. H., East London Mission Clergyman.
Manners, Rev. Frederick Browne, M.A., Vicar of St. Silas's, Hunslet; Vicar of Kirklington, Notts.
Marshall, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Milton, Beds, and Rural Dean of Abingdon; Honorary Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
Marshall, Rev. J. G., M.A., to Officiate in St. Peter's Mission Church in the Parish of St. Mary's, Plaistow.
Maxwell, Rev. H. G., M.A., Rector of Meesden, Herts.
Randolph, Rev. B. W., M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln; Vice-Principal of Ely Theological College.
Salisbury, Rev. N., Vicar of Newton Arlosh, Cumberland.
Todd, Rev. Charles John, M.A., Chaplain to the *Wildfire*.
Todd, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Newnham, Herts.
Tomlinson, Rev. Arthur Roger, M.A., Rector of Lamorran, Cornwall.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ashe, Rev. Thomas, of St. John's College, Cambridge, at 10, Worcester Street, St. George's Square, on the 18th inst. aged 53.
Dawson, Rev. Henry, formerly Rector of Hopton All Saints, Suffolk, and of Bunwell, Norfolk, at Torquay, on the 21st inst., aged 98.
Grice, Rev. William, B.A., for thirty-eight years Rector of Tothill, at Tothill Rectory, Alford, Lincolnshire, on the 19th inst., aged 89.
Johnson, Rev. Harry, Assistant-Curate of Great Berkhamstead, Herts, on the 17th inst., aged 33.
Lynn, Rev. George Goodenough, Vicar of Coniscliffe, at Hitchin, on the 15th inst., aged 80.
Sands, Rev. H. B., for thirty years Vicar of Northwood, Rickmansworth, at Ferndale, Tunbridge Wells, on the 22nd inst., aged 65.
Thackrah, Rev. Samuel, at Trentholme, Redhill, on the 16th inst., aged 41.
Wood, Rev. R. Mountford, Rector of the Parish and Rural Dean, at Aldbury Rectory, on the 20th inst., aged 78.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 028229232